

JUNE 1913

Ten Cents

The New Review

A-MONTHLY-REVIEW-OF-INTERNATIONAL-SOCIALISM

CONTENTS

Paterson . . . West Virginia . . . California	<i>H. S.</i>
The General Strike in Belgium	<i>Paul Louis</i>
Roosevelt	<i>Anton Pannekoek</i>
Syndicalism and Mass Action	<i>Austin Lewis</i>
State Socialism and the Individual	<i>Wm. English Walling</i>
Proportional Representation	<i>J. Salwyn Schapiro</i>
The Home Call	<i>Louise W. Kneeland</i>
The Worker Speaks	<i>Isaac Goldberg</i>
The Dream-Song	<i>Joseph Morse Green</i>
The New Paganism	<i>Tom Quelch</i>
The Overrated John Masefield	<i>Andre Tridon</i>
School Feeding: A Book Review	<i>Grace Potter</i>
A Note on Industrial Concentration	<i>Frank Emerson</i>

150 Nassau Street

New York

The New Review

Published Monthly
by the

New Review Publishing Association

150 Nassau Street, New York City

Alexander Fraser, *President*
Bertha W. Howe, *Treasurer*
Robert M. Lackey, *Secretary*

Herman Simpson, - - - - *Editor*

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

One Year, . . . \$1.00 Six Months . . . \$.50
Canada 1.20 Foreign 1.50
Single Copies, 10 cents

*Entered at the New York Post Office
as Second-Class Mail Matter*

Important Notice

☐ We are compiling a list of names of readers who want to keep posted on the latest Socialist and Radical publications as they come from the publishers.

☐ All those sending in their names will receive from time to time bulletins announcing the latest Radical publications. This service is free of charge.

☐ Send us your name now.

Address:

Publicity
Department

The NEW REVIEW

The New Review

Copyrighted, 1913 by New Review Publishing Association. Reprint permitted with credit

Vol. I.

JUNE, 1913

No. 17

PATERSON

Affairs in Paterson are approaching a climax. The strike is now in its fourth month. The silk industry is completely tied up, not only in Paterson but also in New York. Even the Pennsylvania factories have been largely crippled, for they are dependent upon the dye houses of Paterson. The workers' patience has been sorely tried by hunger, by countless police clubbings, by hundreds of arrests, by the indictments of their chosen and faithful leaders, by the conviction of Patrick Quinlan. But their ranks stand firm and unbroken. Hitherto they have resisted all temptation to reply to violence with violence, but no one can predict what the next day may bring forth. For there is a limit to human endurance.

Throughout this long struggle the course of the strikers has been as peaceful and self-controlled as that of the authorities has been violent and reckless. To the lawless ferocity of the police and courts they have opposed an immovable patience and a dauntless front. To the Judases of the A. F. of L. they have turned a deaf ear. Their solidarity is as admirable as the wisdom they have shown in choosing for their leaders such heroes as Patrick Quinlan, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Carlo Tresca, Adolph Lessig and Haywood. Whatever the ultimate outcome of this long and bitter struggle, it will remain a landmark in the annals of the American proletariat. For these workers have shown hitherto hidden and untapped sources of proletarian strength. Without any organization, without a dollar in their treasury they entered upon this trying and exhausting struggle. And still they stand intrepid, unconquered and unconquerable. Such are the miracles wrought by the revolutionary spirit.

Unconquered and unconquerable, for though they may possibly finally succumb before the onslaught of all the forces of

A SERIES OF ARTICLES ON

Syndicalism and Mass Action

And their Relation to the Political and Economic
Organizations and Activities of the Working Class

Begins in this number of the NEW REVIEW

THIS IS THE FIRST COMPREHENSIVE TREATMENT
Of these Important Phases of the Class Struggle
EVER OFFERED IN AN AMERICAN SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

Austin Lewis, who writes in this number, will be followed by

Anton Pannekoek who will write on:

Socialism and the Labor Unions
and

Gustav Eckstein who will write three articles on:

What is Mass Action?
The French Movement
The German Movement

AND OTHER WRITERS OF INTERNATIONAL REPUTATION

SUBSCRIBE NOW AND READ THE WHOLE SERIES

Kindly Mention the New Review When Writing to Advertisers.

capitalist society, yet the spirit they have evinced will put new life and energy into the hearts of thousands. It is due to their patient endurance and heroic resistance that capitalist society has been compelled to exhibit itself in all its hideous brutality. Employers swing the hunger lash, the police swing their clubs, judges sentence innocent men to jail, juries convict without regard to evidence, and the press publishes poisonous reports and applauds in chorus. Not a single paper in New York that is not Socialist ventures to utter a bold word on behalf of common decency and everyday justice. The mealy-mouthed *Globe* admits that "it seems generally conceded that Quinlan was convicted when the weight of the evidence was that he was not guilty of the offense charged against him," but it hides its horror at this gross miscarriage of justice by demanding that "Haywoodism" be made the scapegoat. The *World* condemns Quinlan because "he was an intruder" and "interfered in an industrial quarrel"; working class solidarity is a crime, while craft division is a virtue. The *Times* inferentially justifies Quinlan's conviction because the Paterson strike, under the leadership of the I. W. W., "has become a part of the general assault of Socialism upon society." The *Times* takes refuge in the fact that the leaders of the A. F. of L. "look upon Socialism as the deadly foe of the organization," just as the *World* rejoices that "every responsible labor organization in America" is a deadly foe of the I. W. W. The *Sun* breathes dire threats for those whose banner bears the motto "No God, No Master," as if the question at issue in Paterson were the existence of the Deity or the continuance of capitalist society, or as if Quinlan had been tried for his views on theology or sociology. Finally the *Evening Post*, the respectable, pacifist, liberty-loving (in foreign lands) *Post*, blurts out the plain, unvarnished truth: "The issue really before the people of New Jersey is not whether Quinlan is guilty, but whether the law is supreme." Capitalist law has shown itself impotent before the portentous phenomenon of the Paterson strike, therefore away with Quinlan to the penitentiary! And after Quinlan will come the turn of Tresca, of Miss Flynn, of Lessig, of Haywood, of every man and every woman who has the ability and the daring to occupy a post of danger in the struggles of the working class.

Such, we repeat, is the temper of capitalist society when confronted with the portentous phenomenon of the revolutionary strike. Whither this will lead, whether to another wholesale execution of "anarchists" as in 1887, no one can now foretell. The

inflammatory reports in the newspapers, the way every utterance of Haywood and his associates is distorted into an attack on the flag, the constant appeal to the basest passions of the propertied classes, are certainly calculated to prepare the public mind for a great catastrophe. And we would be derelict in the performance of our duty if we did not once again point to the indubitable fact that the Socialist party, by adopting Art. II, Sec. 6 in its constitution and by recalling Haywood from its National Executive Committee, has itself contributed to the rise of this arrogant temper, to the loosening of these ferocious passions. No ruling class is to be conciliated by pandering to its guilty conscience and unreasoning fears, but concessions can be wrung and final victory achieved by sturdy self-reliance, by wise and fearless resolution, by inspiring the enemy with fear. Now, as ever, the first and the last word in revolutionary strategy is Danton's *l'audace, encore l'audace, toujours l'audace!*

WEST VIRGINIA

Three months ago, in connection with a discussion in these pages of the brutal war of cliques in Mexico, we called attention to the equally brutal class war which for a whole year past the capitalists of West Virginia were waging upon their mining slaves. That war was the reply of the mine barons to the attempt of the United Mine Workers to organize the miners of West Virginia and to their demand for an increase in wages, a nine-hour day, and recognition of the union. The eviction of the miners from the companies' shacks, the luring into the region of thousands of strikebreakers under false pretenses, the employment of the scum and refuse of society as special police to overawe both strikers and strikebreakers, wanton fusillades upon the miners and their families in their tents on the hillsides, resulting in the killing of men, women and children, the declaration of martial law by two successive governors, one a Progressive, the other a Republican, wholesale imprisonments, trials by courts-martial—such were the weapons employed in this ruthless warfare of the masters upon their rebellious slaves. Every law of the land was violated. The Constitution was trodden under foot. Human life was treated with contempt. All the restraints of civilization were broken through.

The strike has now been settled. Governor Hatfield, like his predecessor a tool of the mine barons, dictated the terms. Some concessions were made to the revolted slaves. They were to have a nine-hour day. They were to be paid semi-monthly. They were no longer to be compelled to buy tools, powder and provisions from company stores. They were to choose checkweighmen so that they might no longer be cheated of their rightful pay. But the right to organize, the most important of all demands, was not conceded. The men were forced to go back to work by the threat of the governor that every one who did not return to the mines would be driven out of the strike zone.

And this settlement has been described by a Socialist in a near-Socialist magazine as a "signal victory"!

After a long and heroic resistance the miners finally yielded to superior force. The mine barons were victorious. But it was a Pyrrhic victory. Of the original 3,500 strikers in the field only 600 remained to bow under the yoke. The others had left the district in search of other masters.

But the courts-martial continued in operation after the victory. The most daring spirits, and particularly Mother Jones, still languished in the jails. Socialist and labor papers were confiscated and suppressed. It was apparent that, having gained a costly and fruitless victory, the masters were bent upon wreaking signal vengeance and destroying the last vestiges of free thought and speech in the district under their control.

But the fire quenched in the Kanawha coal field blazed forth in the United States Senate; to the great astonishment of the coal barons, who thought themselves perfectly safe from that quarter. Have they not been keeping their own representatives there since time out of mind, flesh of their flesh and bone of their bone? Alas, how the times have degenerated! The Goffs and the Chiltons are still there, worthy successors of the Davises and the Elkinses, valiant champions of infinite oppression and unspeakable cruelty. But a new breath has blown over the country, and Senator Kern demands an investigation into the conditions of the infamous old industrial bastille, and Senator Borah, who is familiar with the ways and methods of the mine barons in his own State of Colorado, seconds the demand. In vain does Governor Hatfield order the release of Mother Jones in order to still the storm that is breaking over his head. In vain does he protest that the strike is over, that it has been settled. "The Senate," replies Senator Kern, "is not concerned in the settlement"—though it well might be in the way that

settlement was brought about—"but in the condition which led to the strike. The strike is not the question. Peonage is the question. Reports of the hunting of men across the hills as though they were escaped convicts or wild beasts is the question. Charges of violation of contract labor laws and the use of martial law are among the things we will probe. I propose to have it shown that when federal experts investigated the conditions last year whole pages of the report were suppressed by the Department of Commerce and Labor."

There are many other things to be investigated, deeds of lawlessness and violence and blood committed by the official guardians of the law. Are the officials of West Virginia, its governor, its courts, its militia, no more than tools and hirelings of the coal barons? This is a question well worth determining, for the benefit not only of West Virginia but also of countless other communities in the United States. It has been asserted that a thorough investigation would reveal that most, if not all, of these complaisant public servants of the coal barons are either themselves mine owners or hired employes of the mine owners. The words of Judge Ira E. Robinson, of the State Supreme Court of Appeals, dissenting from the majority when it sustained the trial of prisoners by martial law, shows the extent to which that court went in its subserviency to the coal barons:

The people declared against the suspension of the constitution at any time, war or no war, on any plea whatsoever. Yet the majority of this court holds that it may be suspended whenever the governor by proclamation, right or wrong, sees fit to suspend it. The people ordained that the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus should never under any circumstances be suspended. Yet the holding of the majority is to the effect that the governor may make that sacred writ totally unavailing. The people further ordained that no citizen not in the military service should ever be called to answer before a military court for a civil offense. Yet the majority holds that any citizen may be subject to trial and condemnation before a military commission whenever the governor sees fit to displace the civil courts by a proclamation to that effect.

The whole situation has now been placed before the Senate by Senator Kern. It has been placed before the President by the National Committee of the Socialist party. And the course to be followed by the highest officials of the national government in regard to this momentous question will be fraught with weighty consequences, for good or for evil, to millions of working people who are anxious to learn whether, in so far as they are concerned, this is still a republic, whether, in so far as they are concerned, the path of peaceful, orderly and legal progress is still

open to them, or whether we are living under a Carthaginian oligarchy which, rather than sacrifice the smallest of its own selfish and narrow interests, would drive the whole nation to disaster and ultimate ruin. The working people must have a definite answer to this question, for their own course will be largely determined by that of the national government.

CALIFORNIA

The Anti-Japanese Land bill passed by the legislature of California and signed by Governor Johnson cannot possibly satisfy either the anti-Japanese agitators of that state or the Japanese government. The former have been foiled in their main object. Instead of excluding the Japanese from all landholding, the bill specifically guarantees their treaty rights, whatever these may be, and even as to agricultural land it permits leases for a period of three years. The question of renewing such leases is left undetermined, but even if the courts should ultimately decide it in the negative, ways and means could easily be found for evading such a decision. On the other hand, the principal grievance of the Japanese remains unchanged. Together with other Asiatics of Mongolian or Malay race, they continue to be excluded from American citizenship. A high-spirited people cannot be expected to submit willingly to such a stigma of inferiority.

The present agitation in California against the Japanese must be sharply distinguished from the former agitation against the Chinese. The standard of living of the Chinese was so much lower than that of the whites that they were dangerous competitors of the wage workers as well as of the middle class traders. The Japanese immigrants, on the other hand, soon adopt the American standard of living and demand the same wages as the whites. In fact, the charge has repeatedly been made against them by the employing farmers that whenever opportunity offers they exact "extortionate" wages. And as the law just adopted indicates, the Japanese do not choose to remain casual farm laborers all their life long, but try to buy or lease land and to become independent farmers. From the point of view of the employing farmer, who needs an abundant and cheap supply of

wage laborers during a part of the year, the eagerness of the Japanese migratory laborer to take up farming on his own account instead of working for a master constitutes a serious grievance.

The figures, however, show that even for this grievance there is no adequate basis in fact. The total number of Japanese in California is now about 58,000, or two and one-half per cent. of the population. In 1912 they owned, according to official figures, 12,726 acres, and according to reliable estimates they held 18,000 acres under lease. The total landholdings of the Japanese thus constitute an insignificant fraction of the farm lands of the state, which, according to the census of 1900, amounted to 28,829,000 acres. How then are we to account for the present apparently widespread anti-Japanese agitation in California?

An article in a recent issue of the *Outlook* gives the answer to this question. The pride of the Californians in their American nativity, it appears, is even more bumptious than that of native-born Americans elsewhere. European immigrants tacitly acknowledge the superiority of the native-born and humbly accept their subordinate position. But not so the Japanese. They are the first immigrants to challenge the superiority of the native American and to assert their perfect equality with him. Their proud and independent attitude has angered not only the native American, but also the meek European immigrant, who feels the double slight and resents it bitterly. "None is louder in the demand for Japanese exclusion than the white immigrant or his offspring."

Race feeling has always been particularly intense in California, not only as against Mongolians, but also as against Negroes. "The Californians," says the writer in the *Outlook*. "are the Southerners of the West," and he proves his statement by reminding us of the fact that "the legislature gave striking proof of the state's kinship with the South when it refused by an overwhelming majority to ratify the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution." In part, no doubt, this intense race feeling has been engendered by the fear of Mongolian invasion. But the question naturally arises, why is this feeling so much more intense in California than in the similarly situated states of Washington and Oregon?

The answer, very likely, is to be found in the aristocratic structure of Californian society, which differentiates it from the

two coast states to the north and imparts to it a pronounced Southern physiognomy. And the basis of this aristocracy is furnished by the big fruit growers and bonanza wheat farmers even more than by the merchant kings of the coast cities. According to the census of 1900 the very largest farms, of 500 acres and over, constituted 14 per cent. of the total number of farms in California, as against 10 per cent. in Oregon and 9 per cent. in Washington. The average number of acres to the farm in California was 397, compared with 281 in Oregon and 256 in Washington. The percentage of tenants in California was 23.1, as against 17.8 in Oregon and 14.4 in Washington. The total number of farms in California was about equal to that of the other two states combined but the amount paid out in wages was about two and a half times as large, while the average value of farm property was more than twice as large.

It is primarily in the interest of the employing farmers of California that the Japanese are to be prevented from becoming independent small farmers. It is, therefore, just as foolish for the white wage workers of California to join in the hue and cry against the Japanese as it is for the white wage workers of the South to give a helping hand to their masters in keeping down the Negro. The problem of Oriental immigration is an extremely difficult one for the white wage workers. It cannot be solved by the simple radical formula of internationalism. But neither is it to be solved by the simple reactionary formula of race exclusion. Race prejudice everywhere is a survival, however natural, of the days of savagery and barbarism. It was most intense in the primitive stages of social evolution, when each tribe lived in complete seclusion and in constant fear of its neighbors. It tends to disappear with the amalgamation of tribes, the rise of nations, the growth of continental civilizations, and the establishment of regular and frequent intercourse between distant parts of the globe. The extension of capitalist production to all continents prepares the ground for the total disappearance of race prejudice under Socialism. The recent ebullitions of race hatred—those monstrous reversion to barbarism—would be utterly incomprehensible if they did not signify everywhere an attempt of the exploiting classes to keep a particular section of the working class in permanent and aggravated subjection. In the South this is perfectly obvious, but it is equally true in California.

H. S.

The General Strike in Belgium

By PAUL LOUIS (Paris)

The general strike in Belgium, organized in the interest of universal and equal suffrage, will go down in history as one of the great political events of 1913. It lasted exactly ten days, that is, from the 14th to the 24th of April. During these ten days the most perfect order and discipline prevailed among the crowds that had deliberately suspended labor. The trade unionists formed the nucleus of the strikers, but they were not the only ones to abandon mine, workshop and factory. It has been estimated that 400,000 men, a very considerable portion of the total force of wage earners in Belgium, took part in the movement.

This is not the first time that a general strike has been ordered for political reasons. Not to count the twenty-four hour suspensions of work, used now and then by the Italian proletariat as a protest against the brutal intervention of the army in conflicts between capital and labor, there was a strike of the Swedish laborers with the object of electoral reform. Twice before, in 1893 and in 1902, the Belgians themselves quit work in a body to put an end to a ballot system which created a privileged class and assured the dominance of parties committed to conservative policies and to social reaction. In any case, no previous strike had the duration, the efficiency, and the self-restraint of that of April, 1913. It has been demonstrated at last that a proletariat conscious of its cause, master of its own passions, organized with broad social perspective, and equipped with adequate economic resources in reserve, can accomplish miracles. When this last general strike was declared, many people in Europe simply laughed. They were sure it was destined to fail. They saw it wasting away little by little through the weariness of the workers, through the terror inspired by a few collisions with the police resulting in blood. They saw the Socialist and Unionist enthusiasm sustaining it, if not broken to pieces, at least reduced to impotency. Nothing of the sort! To the very end, the strike never wavered: nothing could divert it from the goal it had set itself; nothing could affect the disciplined calm which had distinguished it from the start.

We shall examine in order the economic situation in Belgium; labor organization in that country; the question of the abolition

of political parties; the preparation for the strike, its proclamation, its development; and finally the reasons which, in the estimation of the militant laborers, justified the resumption of work.

In territory, Belgium is one of the smallest states in Europe. But in density of population per square mile it has few to equal it. While France shows only 72 inhabitants per square mile and Germany about 122, Belgium rises to 255. Its total population is 7,500,000. The great mass of this population—about three-fourths—is concentrated in urban communities, of which the most important are: Brussels and suburbs with 720,000 inhabitants; Antwerp, the great port of the Scheldt, with 320,000; Ghent, the capital of the textile industries, with 165,000; and Liège, the city of iron and coal, with 175,000. In this country, in spite of its unbroken plain (the Ardennes are only a series of rolling hills of insignificant altitude), agriculture does not occupy an essential position. Industry is all-important—coal mining (producing more than twenty million tons annually), iron and steel, zinc, glass, leather, linens, cottons and woollens. The valley of the Sambre and its continuation, that of the Meuse, literally bristle with smoke stacks between the three frontiers of France, Germany and Holland, forming almost one continuous city. The commerce fostered by this vigorous industry is one of the most active in the whole world. It reaches a total of \$1,500,000,000, so that, preserving due proportions, it represents an activity almost double that of England.

It is not difficult to imagine the extent to which the concentration of capital is carried in such a country, nor is the concentration of population less acute. Establishments employing five hundred or even more than a thousand workers are numerous. As early as 1896 the number of workers was placed at 842,000, of whom 196,000 were women. In 1900 there were 1,135,000 workers with 268,000 women. At present there must be more than 1,300,000, for the region of Brussels alone has more than 100,000, Ghent has 42,000, Antwerp 41,000, Liège 38,000, and localities in the neighborhood of Liège, such as Seraing, the home of the great Cockerill metal works, have their entire population in the mills.

It was quite natural that in this close contact of daily toil and daily trials the Belgian workmen should become conscious of their class solidarity. And that is what has actually happened. The Labor party of Belgium has one of the oldest as well as one of the most active and efficient organizations in Europe. It presents one aspect almost unique. In France, Germany, Austria

and Holland, even when the relations between Socialists, Unionists and Coöperators are intimate, there is an official separation between the different branches of proletarian organization. In Belgium the Labor party includes groups of widely divergent activities, held together only by a common ideal.

In 1912, according to a report circulated a few days before the general strike, the party comprised 82,352 members from the co-operatives, 80,961 from the unions, 62,903 from the benefit societies, 13,555 from labor leagues and circles of propaganda, 2,658 from the "young guards" or Socialist apprentices, and 6,092 from groups having some special character. Thus the total reached 248,521 members,—33,500 more than in 1911. However, this number is somewhat inflated. As a matter of fact, many members are here counted several times as unionists, and again as coöperators, or as members of the circles of propaganda. A thorough-going analysis would result in a very considerable reduction.

Brussels has the heaviest enrollment, 41,251; Ghent follows with 31,714; Charleroi, a great mining center, with 18,144; Soignies, a center of mining, stone working and factories, with 27,787, and Liège with 21,409. The Flemish districts, predominantly agricultural and under the thumb of the Catholic clergy, have hitherto made little response to socialistic ideas. There the adherents are much scattered in spite of the propaganda carried on each Sunday.

We have noted nearly 85,000 unionists in the party. They are grouped around the Union Commission, which acts as the National Executive. But besides them, there are more than 100,000 other unionists who either accept the class struggle and prefer, as unionists, to remain independent of every party, or reject the theory of the class struggle, such as the Catholic unionists, numerous in Flanders, or else are indifferent to the question. In any case, at least fifteen per cent. of the Belgian proletariat is organized, with dues similar to those collected in France, and much lower than those paid in England, Germany and Scandinavia.

The Labor party depends, then, partly on the unionists, who gave splendid response to its appeal at the time of the strike, and partly on the coöperators who likewise rendered invaluable support. There were in Belgium, at the beginning of 1912, 205 co-operative groups, with more than 170,000 members, doing \$9,500,000 worth of business with \$1,000,000 of profits. The number of coöperative workers has increased, but the amount of business remains slight; \$57 per family each year, as con-

trusted with \$200 average business in England. Some of these co-operatives, affiliated with the Labor party, have a world-wide reputation, such as the Peuple of Brussels, the Vooruit of Ghent—a splendid creation of Edouard Anseele—the Progrès of Jolimont, the Werker of Antwerp, etc.

The Socialist party, in every respect, is the most efficiently organized of any party in Belgium; the Catholic party, in spite of its superiority in financial resources, does not approach it. The Socialists declared the general strike, because the electoral regime, by maintaining the Catholics in power since 1884, condemned the laboring class to an eternal political inferiority.

Down to the end of the nineteenth century the system of suffrage on the basis of taxes prevailed in Belgium: only those persons who could show receipts for a certain amount of direct tax had the right to use the ballot. The mass of wage earners was thus excluded from the "legal nation". Tenacious opposition brought about the abolition of this system; but the Conservative Right was afraid it would lose control through the coalition of the Liberal and Socialist Left if, according to the principle of "one man, one vote", thorough-going universal suffrage were established. "Plural suffrage", accordingly, was offered as a substitute. On this basis all citizens twenty-five years of age do, indeed, have a vote; but heads of families who pay a certain tax and have reached the age of thirty-five, those also who own real estate or have private incomes, holders of university degrees and those who fill positions requiring special scientific preparation, are granted supplementary votes. There are citizens with one, two, and even three votes, the idea of the whole scheme being to safeguard the predominance of the Catholic bourgeoisie. It has been evident for some time past that strict universal suffrage would spell political disaster for the governmental Right.

At the present moment, out of 185 deputies in the Parliament, 101 are Catholic, 44 are Liberal, 39 are Socialist, and two are Christian Democrats. The Catholics thus have a majority of 16 votes. Before the election of 1912 they had a majority of only six votes, and the Liberals and Socialists thought that by presenting a fusion ticket in most of the electoral districts they could completely overcome this advantage. But they reckoned without their host.

The Belgian Chamber is elected one-half every two years. An analysis of the party returns of 1910 and 1912 shows an actual Catholic vote of 1,342,000, while the Left had 1,448,000. It is clear that plural suffrage puts the Left at a distinct disad-

vantage; but this is not all. The electoral districts are so arranged that the majority of the Left in the country is transformed into a majority for the Catholics in the Chamber. The Left ought to have 95 votes; it has actually 83.

The election of 1912 increased the majority of the Catholics, a majority at once artificial and unjust. It elicited a cry of joy and triumph from the Right. The Liberals, however, came out uncompromisingly for universal suffrage, at the same time deprecating popular uprisings. The Socialists began to consider a general strike. It was in fact becoming impossible to obtain complete electoral equality by any other means. The general strike was the only efficient means of breaking the vicious iron grip in which the people had been writhing for many years.

On June 5, 1912, the General Council of the Labor party met and ordered for the 13th an extraordinary congress to devise a program for assuring the triumph of equal suffrage. This congress was attended by 1,584 delegates representing 994 organizations affiliated with the party and 276 unattached, for all the proletarian associations had been included in the invitation. The congress voted that no later than November, on the assembling of the Chamber, the Socialist deputies should bring before the country a proposal for constitutional revision, and this bill would be sustained by every possible expedient, including, as a last resort, a general strike. At the same time they appointed a National Committee for Universal Suffrage and a General Strike. This committee was made up of the General Council, the Unionist Commission of the Labor party, the committee of the Federation of Coöperatives, and the committee of the National Federation of Trades.

Enthusiastic preparations for the general strike, which already seemed inevitable, were at once begun. Nothing was left to chance. A commission for propaganda took charge of the newspapers, campaign books and tracts. A finance committee began to collect a veritable war fund made up of the carefully managed savings of the workers. A commissary department was established to provide for the feeding of the strikers and for the purchase at wholesale of foodstuffs later to be distributed to the strikers. A special children's committee made preparations for sending the little ones abroad, and particularly in Holland and France the Socialists were asked how many they could house and feed.

On February 7, 1913, the Chamber rejected—Right against the allied Left—the proposal for constitutional revision. The

Catholic cabinet, led by M. de Brocqueville, had come out against revision, although not with complete unanimity. However, the cabinet was subject to the powerful influence of a fanatical reactionary, M. Weeste, Minister of State, Counsellor of the Crown and leader of the Conservatives. There was a report, however, that the King, as a matter of personal preference and through fear of a revolution which might sweep away his throne, was in favor of the suppression of plural suffrage.

On the 12th of April, the National Committee for Universal Suffrage and General Strike found by a test vote that the uncompromising attitude of the Right made the strike unavoidable. Consequently it urged the laboring classes to make the final preparations necessary for the cessation of work on the 14th of April. But suddenly a new situation arose, though not wholly unexpected. The Liberal party had united with the Socialists in the demand for universal suffrage, but it repudiated the general strike in principle, as an extra-parliamentary proceeding, and also because it feared that the Socialist party would derive from it increased prestige. There was a further danger that serious disturbances would result therefrom. The mayors of the large cities (Brussels, Antwerp, Ghent, Liege), with Liberal affiliations, made a last appeal to M. de Brocqueville, the prime minister. The latter gave them such assurances that the cause of equal suffrage seemed won, and in the immediate future. The mayors then conferred with the General Strike Committee. To take away the last argument of the Opposition, namely, that the Chamber could not take any steps under the pressure of a strike, the Committee agreed to suspend the resolution that proclaimed the strike for the 14th of April.

It soon became apparent, however, that the prime minister played a double game. Interrogated in open Chamber by the leader of his party, M. Weeste, he declared that he made no binding agreement, and that there would be plenty of time to see from the elections of 1914 whether the electors were in favor of revision. The rage of the Labor party, which had been thus grossly deceived, knew no bounds, and the general strike, this time beyond recall, was fixed for April 14.

The two weeks preceding this momentous date were actively employed by the organizations. They had in view a strike colossal in extent but pacific in character. As the cooperation of the Liberals seemed to them, rightly or wrongly, indispensable to the certain success of their cause, they redoubled their efforts to secure coolness and discipline. They were afraid that the gov-

ernment, which had made enormous preparations for policing the country, even calling out the civic guards made up of private citizens, would try to provoke a few bloody encounters to discredit the strike and create a pretext for violent suppression. They strained every effort to assure provisions for the strikers. Fortunately, to swell the sums appropriated from organization dues, there came in large gifts from Liberal bourgeois who had been won over to the cause of equal suffrage. For that matter they were not all entirely disinterested, since the reform promised the advent of their party to power.

At the hour prescribed, on the 14th of April, the strike began. The aggressive spirits of the Labor party, those who had preached the strike from the beginning, as well as those who had adopted it as a last resort, scattered to all parts of the country. They urged the workers to drop their tools, and as a precautionary measure they insisted on absolute abstention from alcoholic drinks. In the cities, excursions to the museums, theatres, and other places of amusement were organized to keep the strikers busy.

On the first day 300,000 went out; by the fifth day they numbered 400,000. It was in the coal regions of Liège and of the central Borinage that the most complete general suspension took place. The production of coal was paralyzed, one may say, totally. This alone was enough to compel the cessation of labor in all the other branches of industry. The smelting and glass works were the first to feel the effects, in spite of the threats openly made by the rich Catholic owners. The weavers of Ghent and Verviers, the two textile centers of the country, obeyed the call to the letter. In the Walloon regions, where the population is exclusively French (Mons, Charleroi, Namur, Liège), the strike was much more general than in Flanders. Yet even here Antwerp and Ghent were in the front rank. It was mostly in the small towns of Flanders, where the Socialist influence has always met little encouragement, that desertions from labor solidarity were at all conspicuous. Taken as a whole, the movement was tremendous. By the eighth day, the public services themselves began to cease. The communal departments gradually went out of commission. This meant the failure of water, electricity and gas.

It was idle for the Catholics to affect the pose of official contempt for the whole situation. Their uneasiness became more and more apparent. The outbreaks they were praying for, which would permit the intervention of the army with loaded rifles, re-

fused to materialize. There were important parades at Charleroi, Liège and Mons, but there was no trace of disorder.

So things went on for ten days. Meanwhile the Chamber had convened and the Liberals carried on their conciliatory tactics. They strove to exact from the Prime Minister some promise on which they could definitely rely and which would open the way to electoral reform. Finally he went so far as to say that the committee appointed to study the reform of the ballot in local and provincial elections had received instructions to extend their labors to the question of elections to the Chambers. This expression was not very decisive, but the Liberals seized upon it to give it permanent force by forcing it through on a vote for "the order of the day". It was interpreted as a specific assurance for real revision. The Socialist deputies supported the motion of the Liberals. So did the Catholics. Its adoption was practically unanimous.

It remained to have the attitude of the deputies ratified by a Congress of the Labor party and of the groups supporting the strike. This congress met on the 24th of April at Brussels. There was a sharp debate between those who favored a continuance of the strike and those who wished the resumption of work. The latter held that the proletariat had obtained a real success, since the government had implicitly promised a revision of the electoral system. Their opponents, recruited largely from the miners of Charleroi and from the weavers of Verviers, expressed the fear that the Catholics would again resort to duplicity and examine the principle of the reform only to reject it once more. It was voted by a three-fourths majority to resume work. On the morning of the 25th everybody was at work.

We shall soon know whether real universal suffrage will carry the day, and whether this collective rising of the Belgian proletariat will have all the results claimed for it. Taken as it stands, it remains one of the most brilliant examples of united proletarian effort that history affords.

ROOSEVELT

By ANTON PANNEKOEK (Bremen)

Many attempts have been made to explain the causes of Roosevelt's reappearance upon the political stage and the formation of the Progressive party. In these attempts emphasis has mostly been laid upon the increasing resistance of the lower strata of the bourgeoisie to the rule of the Trusts, as well as upon the necessity of catching the workers with social reforms; but it must be plain to everyone that the characterization of the new party as "petty-capitalistic" is inadequate. In the formation of this new party we have to do not only with a split of the old historic parties—for similar tendencies are found in the Democratic party as well—but also with a new orientation of thought, at first hesitant and vague, which, rising from the instinctive feeling of the bourgeoisie itself, is now beginning to appear in politics. It indicates that social conditions in America have undergone a radical transformation, and at the same time it ushers in a new political era. The nature of this transformation cannot be understood by means of ideas derived from earlier party struggles; a comparison with European politics may be helpful.

The man of the new era is Roosevelt. To the mind still fettered by the old ideas, he incarnates the contradictions of the new political movement. Seldom has a man been subjected to such contradictory judgments as has Roosevelt. At one time he is hailed as a great statesman who earnestly seeks to master the problems of the future, not only for Americans but also for all humanity. At another time he is the man of brute force, the cowboy in politics, a beast of prey with great gnashing teeth. Again he is the man of the people, the reformer, fighting valiantly for the general interests of the commonwealth against trustified capital; and with his reform program he appears to many of our comrades, who see little more in Socialism than a bundle of immediate reforms, to be a dangerous competitor, a counterfeit, a "near-Socialist." But the great majority of our party members regard him simply as an impostor, a demagogue; and indeed it is a fact that he is closely connected with trustified capital, that he defends the "Big Interests" energetically, and

that he attacks the working class movement with immoderate hatred and contemptible means. However contradictory all this may appear, it is correct nevertheless, and the sum total gives an insight into the nature, not so much of the man—his personal traits are rather unimportant—as into the nature of American society, which pushes to the front a man of such characteristics.

America is not merely the land of capitalism at its height; here also the spirit of capitalism, the reckless piling up of profits, has reached its greatest development and become the all-ruling power. The pursuit of the dollar occupies the entire life of men; business reigns supreme in their thoughts and acts; all their ideas and efforts are directed toward business success. All the energy, all the powers of man he bends to personal success and advancement. The American regards the whole world as existing merely to enrich him and make him a respectable citizen; to him the Star Spangled Banner is the symbol of unrestricted liberty to pile up profits. The idea never enters his mind that there are other important interests, common to all, to which he must, in some degree, subordinate his personal interests.

Now this is not the result of any special character of the American people, but a manifestation of the character of the capitalist, the bourgeois, the business man throughout the world. Everywhere the capitalists have directed all their thoughts and deeds toward personal gain. But elsewhere there is also present, to a greater or less extent, the consciousness of a general interest, of membership in a larger community to which the private interest must be subordinated. The general interests and the larger community of which we speak here are not the really general, popular interests, nor humanity as a whole, but the classes and their interests. A class embraces all those who stand in the same position in the process of production and hence have common interests; the general interests to which private interests must be subordinated temporarily, are *common class interests*. The field of these interests is *politics*; the task of the politicians is to champion the interests of their class against the other classes, or the interests of the various groups of the bourgeoisie against one another, the interests generally being hidden behind abstract catch-words and theoretical party formulas. By means of their political struggles the politicians now and then compel even the business men to reflect over their class interests.

That is lacking in America. As expressed by the English writer, H. G. Wells, in his book, "The Future of America," the

American has no sense of the State, he is "State-blind." To him politicians are useless parasites on the bodies of worthy people who earn their bread by the manufacture of gloves or the sale of rice and raisins. And rightly so. For in America politics is a business, a private business of the politician. Politics is "graft," the making of a profit through official position. That every official from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to the policeman or alderman uses his political power for his personal enrichment is a matter of course in America. That the two great bourgeois parties, the Republican as well as the Democratic, are nothing else than well organized bands of politicians, reaching through their followers down into the criminal dives, for whom the control of political office is merely a means to private advantage, is known to every child, and only in Europe do people wonder at it. This political corruption does not signify that Americans are more dishonest than other people; it is merely the transference to politics of the morals of business in which, as is well-known, fraud plays a principal part.

And therein lies a radical difference between politics in America and in Europe. Even in Europe it is an ordinary occurrence for politicians to use their position for personal advantage; but there it is done incidentally, in a shamefaced way, and is publicly censured as an impropriety. Their chief duty is to defend the interests of their class. Let us glance at Germany. The Catholic (Centre party) members of the Reichstag may occasionally seek to obtain good posts for their friends, but the main object of their politics is to fight for their peasants, for the Catholic landowners and capitalists, and for the interests of the Church. The Conservative landowners in the Reichstag do not dare to neglect for personal advantage the common interests of the noble landowners, and these interests also include the strengthening of the power of the monarchy against the Parliament and the furthering of all reactionary tendencies in the State; nor can the Liberal politicians lose sight for a moment of the general interests of the great capitalists. In addition they all have to represent the common interests of the entire possessing class against the claims of the workers and the demands of the Socialists. Therein lies the essential difference between politics in Europe and in America; in Europe politics is the field upon which the general class interests are asserted; in America politics is merely a special field for private interests.

If we seek the cause of this difference we are led at once to the different historic development. In Europe the bourgeoisie

was able to advance only by continual struggle against other classes: the nobility, the clergy, and the princely houses, which originated in the mediaeval method of production. Bourgeois society was able to come into existence only by overthrowing feudalism and absolutism, and that was possible only through a struggle, a class struggle against the powers which had ruled under the earlier social order. In this struggle came into being a clearly defined bourgeois class consciousness; the capitalists, petty bourgeoisie and peasants learned in a practical manner that they must sacrifice treasure and blood for their ideals, for "liberty" and "Fatherland"—which terms formed the idealized expression of their class interests. In the struggle against the ancient powers they learned that there was something higher than their personal private interests, a broader duty that must be fulfilled as prerequisite, if they were to pursue undisturbed their private interests. And even after the decisive battles in the bourgeois revolutions had been fought, the struggle continued; nobility and royalty maintained the fight for their privileges in and against the parliament. But when this struggle gradually came to an end, the proletariat appeared as a new and distinct class that carried on the struggle against the bourgeoisie. And once more this class struggle prevented the capitalists from thinking only of their private enrichment and from regarding the entire world merely from the viewpoint of business; since the entire profit-making system and all business was threatened they must be defended, and this defense of the bourgeois order was to the common interest of the entire bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, the American bourgeoisie has never had to carry on great class struggles.

Amerika, du hast es besser
 Als unser Weltteil, der alte,
 Hast keine verfallene Schlösser
 Und keine Basalte.*

In these lines of a German poet is expressed the reason why America is envied by the European bourgeoisie, which in agonizing struggles fought its way upward against the powers of the Middle Ages. America has known no feudalism, no absolutism, and hence the struggles against them are unknown to her. From the very beginning, since the War of Independence, America has been a purely bourgeois country, with but a

*America, it is better with thee than with our continent, the old, thou hast no ruined castles and no basaltic columns.

single class, a middle class, a rising bourgeoisie. Thus in the absence of other classes, it was not possible for a bourgeois class develop self-consciousness. No deep-rooted class struggle made it necessary to turn from the business of making money; what the European bourgeoisie won painfully and was ever obliged to defend, was a matter of course to the American men of business. The great internal struggles of the Republic, such as the Civil War of 1861, were only conflicts between the business interests of diverse groups of the bourgeoisie; for the slave holders of the South were just as much capitalist exploiters as were the manufacturers of the North. Even the workers found for decades such favorable opportunity for personal advancement that they felt themselves to be a portion of the lower strata of the middle class, developed no clear proletarian class consciousness and gave no thought to a class struggle against the capitalist social order. Where class struggles are lacking, politics is not utilized as a field upon which the general class interests come in conflict; hence politics became a private business.

If this explanation is correct, it follows that this state of affairs cannot continue and that a change must take place. For Socialism is coming to the front, and although it is not yet a great material power, it is already an intellectual one. Before the eyes of American society there is emerging in the distance the spectre of the proletarian revolution which threatens to put an end to all business and all profit. As yet the bourgeoisie is incapable of comprehending, even with moderate clearness, the extent and nature of this danger and of discreetly arming against it. Here, raging blindly, it beats down the striking workers by force, there politicians beguile them with Socialistic demands; and again the professional politicians of both bourgeois parties, after being driven out of office, combine against the Socialists, who have introduced an honest municipal government; but in general the majority of the American bourgeoisie cares nothing at all for politics. Naturally this cannot continue. The more Socialism advances, the stronger does bourgeois class consciousness become; the defense of the bourgeois order against the new enemy must come to be regarded as of paramount importance and politics must be pressed into the service of this cause. In the formation of the Progressive party we see the first signs of a great change, namely, the evolution of American politics from private business and graft to class politics.

Roosevelt is the leader in this new conception of political activity; he has become clearly conscious of the general interests

of the bourgeoisie. His superiority to other American politicians lies in the fact that he is no business politician, but has a sharp sense of politics as an instrument of class interests. Hence he talks eagerly of the community of the nation, to whose general interests private interests must yield; but the community that he means is always the bourgeois world, the bourgeoisie, and has nothing at all in common with that which Socialism understands by the community of the entire people; on the contrary it is diametrically opposed to it. Hence there is no contradiction in the fact that at the same time he represents the interests of great capital, not only in internal affairs, but also external, as an imperialistic world-politician. But he does not represent it in the sense that he unconditionally submits to the predatory desires of the Trusts; while many a President and many a Cabinet Officer has been in his official capacity the mere clerk of Morgan and Rockefeller, Roosevelt confronts the Trust magnates as an independent power; he understands that trustified capital must yield somewhat, in order that its intolerable tyranny may not endanger capitalism as a whole. When he urges reforms he does so only in order to render the capitalist system the more impregnable. He hates Socialism from the very depths of his soul; indeed there is, perhaps, no other man in America who hates Socialism so deeply, so thoroughly, so extravagantly as he does. Others may feel themselves to be threatened by the labor movement in their private business or in their political swindling; their hatred is private, petty hatred, such as they also have for their competitors. But in him lives and trembles all the fear and anxiety of the ruling classes face to face with the overthrow of bourgeois society, which appears to him as the end of civilization, the end of the world; this at times whips him to deeds of senseless rage. As the capitalist class regards any means as justifiable in the struggle against the rebellious proletariat, he too is capable of anything; but he does not yet know what he wants. His impulsive, vacillating acts are the expression of the uncertainty of the American bourgeoisie in its attitude toward the new enemy. Rough, unscrupulous and brutal, well-informed and crafty, he is just the man whom the American bourgeoisie needs in the new struggle, and to whom it looks as a future leader and ruler. His appearance in his latest role is a proof that Socialism in America is beginning to become a serious matter.

Thus are explained the apparent contradictions in his behavior. The Progressive party is not simply a reform party;

reforms constitute one of the means of strengthening the bourgeois order against Socialism, but attempts at repression by force are also occurring everywhere, and no one will believe that Roosevelt is too soft-hearted for such work. Nor is it a semi-Socialist party competing with Socialism and taking the wind out of its sails; when it attempts to inveigle the workers, it does so as a capitalist party, which seeks to counteract the awakening of a proletarian class consciousness. Therefore the struggle against it is best adapted to awaken a pronounced Socialist class feeling, since we can no longer advance through indignation against the Trusts or against political corruption. Only those who see in the Socialist movement a mere striving for social reform or honest municipal government, have any occasion to regard the Progressive party as a competitor.

But just as little is the Progressive party a petty-bourgeois party. Therein lies the difference, in spite of many points of contact, between it and the Democratic party, between Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. This does not mean that they do not exhibit common traits, for the characters of the various parties are as yet not definitely formed. The parties grope instinctively under the influence of newly born and still obscure feelings, moods and needs, and practically they do not as yet show the sharp delineation of definite, antagonistic characters, which we here emphasize theoretically in order to comprehend them more clearly. But if we keep this limitation in mind, we may say that one party, the Democratic, is essentially petty-capitalistic; its purpose is—in theory only, for in practice these parties can govern only in the interests of great capital—to trim down the modern capitalistic and monopolistic structures which do not fit into the picture of capitalism, and which therefore seem to it to be defects, abnormalities and foreign bodies; it incarnates the rebellion of the mass of the bourgeoisie against the pressure of the Trusts and against trustified government. The other party, the Progressive, is essentially a party of capitalism in general; it incarnates the growing bourgeois consciousness of the proletarian menace, and demands from the Trusts only such consideration and self-limitation as is necessary to the maintenance of the bourgeois order; hence it can without hypocrisy play the politics of great capital. The one party is reactionary, just as are the majority of petty bourgeois parties in Europe, in so far as it seeks, theoretically at least, to reduce capitalism to an earlier stage; the other party is conservative (like the liberal parties in Europe) in so far as its purpose is to

uphold existing capitalism and to prevent further progress toward Socialism. To be sure, this contrast does not exhaustively portray the characters of these two parties. But it is certain that the appearance upon the political stage of Roosevelt and the Progressive party signifies the beginning of a consolidation of the bourgeoisie into a class party, the combination of all the forces of bourgeois society in the struggle against Socialism and the beginning of the final struggle of Socialism for a new social order.

Syndicalism and Mass Action

By AUSTIN LEWIS

I.

The established Social Democratic theory of working class tactics is being shaken; the occurrences of the last few years have caused the old plan of action to appear obsolete, and the tactics of the German Social Democracy, the mentor and exemplar of the Social Democrats throughout the world, have reached the limit of practical usefulness. This German Social Democratic movement has characteristic marks. Politically democratic, it marshals its battalions under the theoretical banners of Marx. Its philosophers and writers still expound and explain Marxism in terms of the last century. Painstaking and vigorous and equipped with a wealth of research and a depth of reasoning which the Socialists of other countries have tried in vain to emulate, it has yet been unable to escape the consequences of its environment, and is dogmatic in content as it is bureaucratic in actuality.

To the German Social Democrat the path of the social revolution is as clear as print. The course is charted and the shoals are all marked. The rocks of anarchism are as certainly buoyed as the quicksands of liberal reform. The ship of the Social Democracy, well found, well officered, and well manned, is bound for the harbor of the Co-operative Commonwealth with a set of sailing instructions, sufficiently detailed to meet all the exigencies likely to confront so highly respectable a craft at any stage of its travels.

The orthodox Social Democratic theory of tactics may be stated briefly as follows: The working class movement has two

wings or arms. The one is political, the other industrial. Both of them are admirably under discipline and perfectly controlled. The industrial is to meet the capitalist in the shop and to secure such secondary benefits as may be had by mere trade union activity. The political is to fight the hated capitalist in the political chamber, to put its finger into the mess of capitalistic politics, to support the industrial as long as the latter consults the political, is reasonable in its demands and pacific in its actions, and finally to land the proletarian in a sort of heaven called the Co-operative Commonwealth.

The main condition of this beatific result is that the industrial wing or arm must always act in conjunction with and subsidiary to the political limb. Hence there must be subordination and discipline. The bureaucratic managers must have entire control of both motor limbs. Should the industrial limb show any rebellious tendency towards independent action, it must be promptly repressed as an unrelated and irrational movement.

The result has justified the policy and satisfied the requirements of the managers of the bureaucracy. A wonderful political party polling four and a half million votes has come into existence, and with it a trade union organization of more than two million.

Germany, however, is not in the forefront of proletarian achievement. Its vote produces wonder, envy and amazement on the part of the Social Democrats of other countries, but Germany lags behind in the matter even of nineteenth century democracy. Its unions are numerically powerful and financially influential; yet the proletarians of the world receive no impetus from the German trade unions. They have no conspicuous place among the proletarian brigades which have won fame in industrial conflict.

There is something rigid about the proletarian movement in Germany, in spite of its wisdom, its philosophy, its intellectual freedom and its indomitable plodding industry.

The most recent and complete statement of the Social Democratic attitude is to be found in the reply of the "General-Kommission der Gewerkschaften Deutschlands" on the 23rd of October, 1912, to the invitation of the "Confederation Generale du Travail" to take part in a great anti-war demonstration in Paris. The secretary of the German organization, in laying down the conditions upon which the German unionists would co-operate in a matter so vital to working class interests and so important to humanity, writes:

We agree with you that in order to preserve peace we must organize demonstrations against war. But you will remember the substance of the interview which I had with you in Berlin at the time you invited us to take part in a demonstration that you had prepared in Paris. We then explained to you that in Germany we consider such demonstrations as political and that it rests with the German Social Democratic party as the political representative of the working class to undertake such demonstrations. Union workingmen do everything to support the action of the party without organizing demonstrations on their own account or independently of the party. The class struggle of the German proletariat depends upon one and the same principle in the field of labor organization as in the field of politics. The unions are considered to be the representatives of the economic interests of the working class, while the Social Democratic party defends its political interests. The unions and the party co-operate in everything which affects the general interests of the working class.

The writer then goes on to state that the German trade unions will not participate in a demonstration against war unless the French unions organize the demonstrations in co-operation with the Socialist party and invite the German Social Democratic party as well as the German unions and have Socialist party speakers. He then concludes his letter in the following words, which seem almost grotesque in consideration of the foregoing: "With you, comrades, we are unanimous in condemning a barbarous and fratricidal war, and desire to maintain peace in Europe and between civilized nations at any cost." (*Voix du Peuple*, Nov. 24, 1912.)

It is obvious that the cost of ignoring the Social Democratic party is considered by the German union officials as too heavy a price to pay for peace.

The Austrian unions under the influence of the same tactical theory took precisely the same position. As the *Voix du Peuple* plainly puts it, "The labor federations of Germany and Austria refused our proposals, disguising their refusals by formulating conditions which they knew that the resolution of our congress prevented us from accepting."

It would be difficult to find a more complete adherence to a too limited theory of proletarian tactics. When the party, which was ostensibly formed upon the basis of international working class action, actually becomes an obstacle to the development and carrying out of such working class action, it will be admitted that the advocates of the theory are rigid in their faith even if the outcome cannot be described as satisfactory from the general outlook of the labor movement.

The dogmatic attitude which forbids the recognition of those labor organizations not affiliated with a political party cannot long stand the erosion of modern industrial development. The unions of England and the United States would come under the ban of the German Social Democracy and

we should have the ridiculous spectacle of an entire labor movement ignored in a peace crusade, because the labor organizations as such have not chosen to take part in politics. Such an attitude would place the labor movement of the world under the control of such people as for the time being directed the industrial and the political movements. The two-wing theory means the politician in control, even to the detriment of the entire proletarian movement. Results appear to justify the policy of keeping the labor organizations out of politics.

The foregoing must not be considered as critical of the attitude of the German Social Democratic and labor movement. In fact, a distinct exception must be made in their case, for the conditions are such that no other step could be taken. Were the German unions as such to take part in what the government would construe as political action, the results would be dangerous to the entire German labor movement. But the German theory has been accepted in countries where the conditions are not such as to necessitate this, with the result that the politicians impose themselves upon the industrial movement to its detriment. This has been seen in Great Britain recently, and is still more obvious in the United States. In France the working class is repeatedly warned by the Socialist party deputies not to engage in industrial conflict, the latter promising their good offices in the Chamber as long as the unions obey orders. Everywhere, indeed, we find instances of this desire on the part of the politicians to exercise control.

Recent labor demonstrations in Europe have tended, however, to disturb this complacency. Spontaneous strikes have arisen not only without the leadership and advice of the great labor leaders and the labor bureaucracies, industrial or political, but in a direct antagonism to these. The working class, the masses, have in more than one instance taken the bit in their teeth and have plunged into the fray regardless of consequences and careless of criticism. The results have been particularly trying for the political wing, which has found its supremacy thus threatened, and has therefore been driven in some cases to support a fight which it did not initiate, in others to denounce the fighters even while they were at blows with the enemy, and in still others to destroy the effect of the industrial independent movement by parliamentary machinations.

In France the syndicalist movement, poor in resources and practically untrained in the modern industrial fight, by virtue of the mass-action initiated, gained the admiration of the pro-

letariat of other countries even in defeat. The British proletariat in the mining and transportation industries also showed the world an example of solidarity and daring militancy beyond all former experience; for a few weeks Britain reeled under the shock of the proletarian onslaught and the world again wondered at the effects of mass-action, unpracticed, unrehearsed, untrained and apparently resting upon the spontaneous movement of large bodies of men who had not hitherto operated in the proletarian armies. In the United States a mixed and motley mass of workers of many races and languages flung themselves against the masters of the textile industry, a very powerful concern with enormous political influence, and in spite of extreme poverty and disadvantages which might ordinarily have been considered insuperable, snatched a dramatic victory under trying conditions.

In contrast with the success of these mass-actions must be noted the recent failures of the great organizations.

These events penetrated the studies of the theorists. The clamor in the unions found its intellectual echo. Hence a new controversy arose. Once more a new fact had to be considered. Once again the new conditions had been met spontaneously, almost automatically, by the rank and file, and the generals began to work out a new theory corresponding to the new tactics, or to abuse the new as a contravention of old established maxims, just as the Austrian generals abused the tactics of the young Napoleon.

Pannekoek puts the reason for the discussion very plainly as follows (*Neue Zeit*, Nov. 22, 1912):

The cause of the new tactical differences arises from the fact that under the influence of the modern form of capitalism the labor movement has taken on a new form of action, to wit: mass-actions. In their first stages they were greeted and propagated by all Marxists as a sign of revolutionary development, as a consequence of our revolutionary tactics. But as they developed to a powerful actual fact new problems arose; the question of social revolution which had been a remotely contemplated aim showed itself to the eyes of the proletariat as a question which was beginning to be pressing; and the tremendous difficulties of the task became apparent. Thence arose two distinct intellectual tendencies; one grasped the problem of revolution and sought by investigation to determine the significance and power of the new modes of action; the other, appalled at the difficulties of the task, followed the old parliamentary forms and tendencies. The new fact of the labor movement brought about an intellectual separation between those who had hitherto been the champions of the Marxian party tactics.

Kautsky published more than a year ago a brochure on "Mass Movements," which however fails to show any real appreciation of the new development and might have just as easily and as effectively been written in the nineties. The echoes of the old fights with the anarchists still rumble in his brain and

whatever is not of the orthodox Social Democracy in his estimation cometh of evil. He does not appear to grasp the factors in the new fight. He finds in it the same elements as appeared long ago when he and his associates were endeavoring to create an organization. But the elements are by no means the same. The mass psychology of to-day is not identical with that of an earlier period, in fact it is quite other, and for a reason which the Marxian theory at once points out: the economic *milieu* is different.

It is remarkable that an accomplished and thoroughly instructed Marxist like Kautsky should fail to detect the very essential difference between mass-action as displayed in the street demonstrations of the bourgeois during the revolutionary epoch, and the movements of the modern proletariat.

He says in his "New Tactics" in reply to Pannekoek (*Neue Zeit*):

Concerning this I must remark that it is just as false to call the mass to-day simply proletarian as it is to call that of the French Revolution bourgeois. It is perfectly true that in the mass at the time of the great French Revolution there were engaged in street fighting fewer wage workers than we now have, but the slum-proletariat was very numerous and the hand-workers themselves were in the great majority of the wage earning proletariat and were practically without anything. The class combination making up the mass was just as varied as it is to-day, with this difference, that the great industrial proletariat which is to-day dominant was then entirely lacking. So the matter is not so simple as Pannekoek makes out when he says that the mass was bourgeois yesterday but is proletarian to-day.

The mass-actions of the proletariat with which we deal, have been as free from the marks of slum proletarians as they have been generally free from disorder of all description. There has also been a notable absence of bourgeois influence.

As Pannekoek very clearly says, "For Kautsky mass-action is an act of revolution, for us it is a process of revolution."

II.

There is no advantage to be gained in approaching a problem of this kind with preconceived notions. It is a new problem. It is not a variation of the old, and the old standards cannot be applied to it, because, we must repeat, the antecedent conditions are different; as Pannekoek says, "The actions of a slum-proletariat, a petty bourgeois, a peasant and a modern proletarian mass must of necessity be different." Unless this is so, the doctrine of the psychological effect of economic environment is entirely false, and the great Marxian premise on which we have builded a theory of history and the whole body of our philosophical teaching must be abandoned.

The development of the trust and of the machine industry has produced a new proletariat, as it has also produced a new middle class. This new proletariat has distinct qualities, marking it off essentially from its predecessor. It is precisely from this new proletariat that the so-called mass-actions proceed. Large bodies of men and women with none of the preliminary training and certainly none of the drill and discipline of labor organization, whether political or industrial, are aroused to action. Their movement is definite and precise; it is bold and confident. It is marked not by violence, but by determination, and it is, what the movements of the organized labor bodies have seldom been, revolutionary, although unconsciously so. What is this but the natural reaction of the machine and industrial proletariat against the environment? If the greater capitalism does not produce the industrial proletariat, with his revolutionary proclivities and his inevitable tendencies to mass action, wherein lies the hope of the social revolution? The working of the new system is not as obvious in Germany as in the United States, and the broadening of the industrial horizon with all its educational effect upon the mind of the proletariat has not yet made itself so manifest there as here. Moreover an elaborate system of social reform has contributed to obscure vital issues.

For these reasons we may assume therefore that Kautsky is not in possession of the economic and, consequently, psychological factors which have tended towards the production of the phenomenon of mass-action.

It must be this lack of knowledge which causes him to regard mass-action as street demonstrations, and to think of public disorder as the distinguishing mark of such actions. Thus in his "New Tactics" he says:

I did not by any means forget to investigate from what class the mass was made up which I examined in my articles, that which gets together in unorganized spontaneous street demonstrations, and I only speak of this here because I want the reader to keep it in mind as we proceed. On page 45 of my article I examined what elements might take part in such actions in Germany. I arrived at the result that, without counting children and workers on the land, there were about thirty millions of people of which a tenth part was organized labor. Unorganized workers made up the rest, affected to a great degree with the ideas of the peasant, the bourgeois and the slum-proletariat, and finally not a few members of the last two classes.

Everyone aware of the facts concerning mass-action in the United States must know that street demonstrations form an inconspicuous factor in such proletarian movements. So far from the street demonstration being an important factor in mass-

action, its relative value declines in this country, at least, and the general tendency is to discourage such manifestations.

Even the value of parades peaceably conducted and thoroughly organized is estimated by the working class at less than it was a few years ago. The tendency is to keep out of the streets, to avoid mobs, and to give the police no opportunity to crack skulls and to turn a working class demonstration into a scene of disorder and trouble.

Still the idea that mass movement of necessity implies a street row appears to persist, for we find Eckstein writing:

Unquestionably street demonstrations have their importance in the proletarian movement, particularly on the political side. They make a show of irresistible force and display in case of resistance the determination and courage of their participants. Great, well-disciplined, and carefully organized street demonstrations are standard weapons of the proletariat of the great industry. Street rows, such as have been prepared by the Nationalists in Prague and the Syndicalists in France have the stamp of petty bourgeois all over them.

"Street-rows" are and have always been the mark of the undeveloped labor movement, and have occurred most frequently in places where mass-action of the modern type is quite unknown. In the earlier stages of the labor movement in all countries we find the same mob displays. The American labor movement in its infancy culminating in the Haymarket tragedy, showed many evidences of such turbulence, but none of these could be described as mass-action of the industrial proletariat. They were, on the contrary, for the most part demonstrations of the craft unionists who have much in common with the small bourgeois and whose mode of fighting has many of the same characteristics.

To this effect we may quote Eckstein, with whom for once we are pleased to be in substantial agreement. He says:

The petty bourgeoisie, where it is rebellious, is closely attached to anarchism, not only as regards opposition to the state, but as against every kind of centralized power. In this respect it is differentiated markedly from the proletariat of the greater industry to whom the process of production itself declares the necessity of a centralizing tendency. The proletariat is against government as the instrument of the will of the ruling class, but it is not against the systematic organization and control of production of which the petty bourgeois has no comprehension. The ideal of the latter is a free society of independent small producers. . . .

The petty bourgeois is naturally an individualist. Under the compulsion of necessity he can act with others of his kind for an immediate purpose, but he cannot create a permanent organization devoted to continuous work for a common interest.

This passage might even have gone further and included the pure and simple trade unions as being almost at one with the small bourgeois in this respect. In fact the actions of the skilled artisans have generally tended to show that they have a

closer psychological connection with the small middle class than with the industrial proletariat.

Actually the new mass-action movement has produced less disorder, fewer street demonstrations and an insignificant amount of friction with the police and the authorities as compared with former labor activities.

A reason for this may be found in a distinction overlooked by Eckstein in the above quotation. He says in effect that the rebellious small bourgeois is against government as such, but that the proletariat is against it only as expressing the will of the ruling class and as an instrument of that class. There is a Social Democratic flavor about this which, whatever else it may be, is certainly not Marxian. It implies that although a capitalist government may be all wrong, a Social Democratic government would be acceptable.

A proletarian government is of course unthinkable, at least in terms of any concept of government which we have at present. The modern industrial proletariat seldom troubles his head about government. The real Marxian idea of the government as being the mere mirror of the actual power, the economic and industrial control, has completely entered into his consciousness and he knows that he has nothing to do with government until he has possession of the material power which lies at the base of all government.

This notion once in the mind of the masses, the field of industrial conflict is transferred at once from the streets, where it has no place, to the shop, the natural and unavoidable battlefield. Hence the fact that modern mass-action is neither tumultuous nor inclined to anti-governmental outbreaks. It is true that where organizations are weak and have entered on a fight for which they are not prepared, and where the position of the government is so secure that it feels able to use the police with impunity, violence may occur. But such examples are belated instances of a pre-organization period with which mass-action has no connection, seeing that mass-action is an altogether later development.

As long ago as 1905 Bebel said in the Party Congress at Jena:

Situations are approaching which must of physical necessity lead to catastrophes, unless the working class develop so rapidly in power, numbers, culture and insight that the bourgeoisie lose the desire for catastrophes. We are not seeking a catastrophe, of what use would it be to us? Catastrophes are brought about by the ruling classes.

It should be observed that seven years have elapsed and we are still not confronted by any catastrophes. The reason is that the working class is working out the question and is itself developing the ability to meet the situation and to avoid those catastrophes which can only result in benefit to the dominant class.

It is worth noting, however, that the minds of so many of the moderate Social Democrats, like those of the Anarchists, dwell continually upon catastrophe. Victor Berger, for instance, in the Socialist party convention at Chicago in 1908, said:

"In order to be able to shoot even, some day we must have the powers of the political government in our hand at least to a great extent."

Morris Hillquit's heroic declaration that he would be found fighting "like a tiger at the barricades" has become historical, and even William English Walling, usually so cool and reliable, in "Socialism As It Is" feels constrained to make the following remarks:

"The majority of Socialists have no inclination towards violence of any kind at the present time, whether domestic or foreign, and will avoid it also for all time if they can. But they fear and expect that the present ruling class will undertake violent measures of repression which will inevitably result in a conflict of physical force."

All this is nonsense to the trained industrialist. Troops are of little use in a shop fight, for there is no opportunity to use them, and against peaceable mass demonstrations they are worse than useless. The wanton employment of armed force against a peaceful demonstration would be the end of any existing government. Besides, the anti-militarist campaign is an essential concomitant of a real industrial movement. This may be seen in France and there are also plenty of evidences of it in England. Whatever may happen, the bourgeois regime will not die fighting in the streets.

The political speaker, engaged in making agitation and gathering votes from a mass of unorganized people, is obliged to make constant appeals to a mob-psychology which he observes to be generally shifting and unreliable.

Hence he concludes that the mob is fickle, which is, indeed, true when it is lashed with a sudden emotion under the influence of an idea. But an organized mass moving to a material end has essential elements of stability, so that there does not seem to be any good reason why it should not be capable of a definite and even prolonged efficiency and cohesiveness. Indeed, such recent examples of mass-action as have come under our observation tend to show a resolution and perseverance not

surpassed by any of those organizations of too closely organized crafts which Kautsky appears to regard as models. It is true that it is impossible to maintain a protracted struggle in the form of mass-action but such considerations pertain rather to the technique of strikes than to the general question of the utility of mass action as a revolutionary weapon, and do not call for examination at this particular point.

A Socialist political party as we have seen it in this country and as it exists everywhere, is composed of such diverse elements, is so little conscious of any real aim, that it must of necessity fail to accomplish any revolutionary results. To contemplate the Socialist party with its diverse views and its mutually antagonistic philosophies carrying out a successful piece of mass organization or mass action, is to indulge in vain and idle speculation. It could do no such thing. Neither can it be expected to do so. It is the recognition of this which makes Kautsky not only antagonistic to, but incapable of understanding, mass action in the sense in which we employ the term.

Pannekoek perhaps puts the matter as satisfactorily as possible when he says:

"When we speak of mass-action we mean an extra-parliamentary political act of the organized working class, by which it operates directly and not through the medium of political delegates. The organized labor fights in which the masses have hitherto engaged, as soon as they come to have political significance develop into political mass-action. In the question of mass-action there is, therefore, also involved simply a broadening of the field of action of the proletarian organization."

These words sum up admirably the present contention of the revolutionary Socialist wing of the labor movement in this country. They embrace practically the entire category of statements with which the industrial Socialist meets the contentions of the bourgeois and reform wing of the Socialist party. Real mass action is outside the sphere of parliamentary action. It has nothing to do with the election of men to political positions and yet it is in the highest degree political.

The fundamental Marxian thesis, as further developed and interpreted by Engels, leads straight to this end. The psychology of the workers, produced by their conditions of employment, becomes expressed in mass action directed towards a concrete and determined economic end. This action must of necessity result in political expression or, as the phrase runs, in a political reflex of the actual economic fact.

In view of this the resolution of the Socialist party convention, which tried to define political action simply in terms of parliamentary action, becomes absurd and marks a degree of

practical ineptitude seldom equalled in a body presumably possessed of some historic knowledge and philosophic grasp. It is, in effect, a repudiation of the fundamental Marxian idea, a deliberate turning of the back upon the most pregnant and profound doctrine of the whole Socialist movement. Without the Marxian doctrine, Socialism is a resting place for sentimentalists and reformers, adventurers and hucksters, a mere protestant sect. To confine the term "political" merely to those manifestations which are directed towards the election of individuals and the acts of such elected individuals, is to place the Socialist movement absolutely in the grasp of the political adventurer.

Mass action is not "action of the streets," nor is it the turbulence of political mobs directed against established government and marked by rioting. It is the action of the organized working class.

State Socialism and the Individual

By WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING

(Concluded.)

Can we imagine that the governing class would make a serious or honest effort to use such an army of labor chiefly for the purpose of developing those who compose it? Even if it were not exploited for private ends or those of a class, would it not be shaped and perpetuated for what it would bring the rest of the community rather than for what it would do for its members? What startling large and growing armies of what Mrs. Gilman calls "degenerates" and persons "below a certain grade of citizenship" we may expect to see! Already in Alabama 10,000 convicts are employed in the mines and more is paid for them per capita than to many free miners. The United States Steel Corporation employs them in large numbers and the annual profit to Alabama, about \$400,000, is no mean sum for a relatively poor State. In Georgia the convicts are now employed exclusively on roads, and this has the effect of popularizing among the white farmers the policy of sentencing negroes for slight offenses or on slight evidence—the power to do which lies entirely in white hands. I have already shown the demand in the South for the tightening of one form of this coerced labor. When it is preached by prominent sociologists that under an improved and more humane social system it is not only a good thing practically but the best thing theoretically, are we not certain to see it in-

crease—to the common benefit of the corporations, the white farmers, and the taxpayers of the State?

At the International Prison Conference of 1910 President Butler of Columbia University could find no words too strong to express his enthusiasm for this new and little utilized civilizing power, which does not even compete with free labor. He is reported to have said:

Do we even in a faint way estimate the possibilities of the employment of persons in many lines of conservation of the water, the land, and the forests? We have indications not only from Michigan City and from Bridgewater, Mass., of what can be done in the reclamation of land, but European experience also is suggestive. Agricultural prisons have been established in England, New South Wales, Prussia, Austria, Hungary, Switzerland, France, Russia and Belgium. European labor colonies have much to teach us.

Why, since prisoners made again habitable the abandoned soil of Rhode Island, can they not reclaim the tide-flats of New Jersey and everglades of Florida? If prisoners build dykes in Europe and levees in Louisiana, why not elsewhere? In Europe the courses of streams have been changed, mountains tunneled, and canals built by prisoners. In the great mountain districts of the United States, in the lands of disappearing timber and along our own sandy shores, there are possibilities already without limit.

The temptation is very strong for persons believing as President Butler does, to increase the number of prisoners—especially of such classes as can be “detained on the ground that it is for their own good.”

If Mrs. Gilman uses the word “enlistment,” Prof. Giddings chooses the more honest word “enslavement,” for a similar proposal. “Society,” he says, “should enslave—not figuratively, but literally—all those men and women who voluntarily betake themselves to a life of vagabondage.” It is easy to define the vagabondage of a pauper and to enslave him. But there are so many other kinds! At any rate we can begin, as usual, with the most defenseless.

“The key to the solution of the social problem,” says Prof. Giddings, in what may be considered as an authoritative definition of the attitude of “State Socialism” towards the individual, “will be found in a frank acceptance of the fact that some men in every community are inherently progressive, resourceful, creative, capable of self-mastery and self-direction, while other men, capable of none of these things, can be made comfortable and essentially free, only by being brought under bondage to society and kept under mastership and discipline until they have acquired power to help and govern themselves.”

The only qualification that needs to be added to this definition is that there is no general expectation that such a policy can be applied for a very long period to the upper classes, and that no plan has yet been proposed by which this could conceivably

be accomplished. In the meanwhile, this policy would make the liberty of the lower classes even less, when compared with the upper, than it is to-day.

Mrs. Gilman's proposal of an industrial army is by no means an isolated one. On the occasion of the use of the United States troops to fight forest fires in the summer of 1910, the editor of the *New York Evening Journal* sketched a whole plan of campaign for such an army. As in all “State Socialist” schemes this army is to be used for the advancement of industry in general, rather than of the “army” itself. For even the proposed increase of its labors in hard times, though intended to benefit the unemployed, would doubtless mean, in its practical working-out, low wages and cheap labor for the benefit of the rest of the community and only secondarily the improvement of the “army.” In the meanwhile military discipline is to be maintained and an unexampled pretext is presented for its gradual extension over society—even *in times of peace*—and especially during labor disturbances.

How difficult it would be to convince the superficial of the menace that lies in this army of “nature fighters” who “fight and work for the people.” Yet it might be used even more easily than another and less popular army either to check democracy in times of peace or to tempt us on to war.

There is a remarkable similarity between the pictures drawn by the editor of the *Evening Journal* and Mrs. Gilman, and those of President Butler and Mr. Kelly. After all the difference is only that between the soldier at work and the convict at work. And whatever dissimilarities may exist between soldiers in their barracks and convicts in their prison there is comparatively little when they are both set to work in the open air, with similar discipline, and are engaged at the same kind of employment.

It would seem that in the minds of most “State Socialists” and social reformers the cure of “poverty” and of the industrial inefficiency of the workers is united indissolubly with coercion, if not with military government. “The sensible course,” says Bernard Shaw, “would be to give every man enough to live well on, so as to guarantee the community against the possibility of a case of malignant disease of poverty, and then (necessarily) to see that he earned it.” The State is to decide what work and how much work the individual shall do, and then compel him to do it.

Socialism began to take theoretical shape while individualism was still supreme, and at that time “State Socialism” had no-

where been taken up by capitalist statesmen and economists—with the possible exception of a brief period in France during the revolution of 1848. Nearly all the ambiguities of Socialism arise from this fact. For the true antithesis of individualism is not Socialism but “State Socialism,” and Socialism, on the other hand, is only to be understood as the antithesis of “State Socialism,” and indeed cannot be said to have an altogether distinctive existence except as a reaction against “State Socialism.” All the best-known of the early organizers of the Socialist movement, however (except Lassalle), were fully aware of this, as they had French experiments immediately before them.

That the great Socialist thinkers have by no means been worshippers either of the State or of society, may be sufficiently seen from a few expressions in Bebel's chief work, “Woman.” “With the abolition of private property and class antagonism,” says Bebel, “the State too will gradually pass out of existence,” and the great Socialist leader reinforces his position with a quotation from Engels' “Anti-Duehring.” He then describes the transformation of the present state into a Socialist society:

The State was the official representative of society as a whole, its unification in a visible body; but it was this only *in so far as it was the State of that particular class* which itself represented society as a whole at its time; in antiquity, the slave-owning citizen; in mediaeval days, the feudal nobility; in our own day, the bourgeoisie. By finally becoming the actual representative of society as a whole, *it renders itself superfluous*. As soon as there will be no social class that needs to be repressed, as soon as the conflicts and excesses will be removed that are rooted in the present anarchistic methods of production and the individual struggle for existence, there will be nothing to necessitate a special power of repression, a State. The first act wherein the State will appear as the true representative of the whole body social—the act of taking possession of the means of production in behalf of society—will at the same time be its last independent act as State. State interference with social relations will become superfluous in one domain after another and will finally fall into disuse. Instead of a government of persons, there will be an administration of things and a direction of the processes of production. The State will not be abolished, it will die.

Together with the State will vanish its representatives: ministers, parliaments, standing armies, police, courts, lawyers and district attorneys, prison officials, collectors of taxes and duties; in short, the entire political apparatus. . . .

The great and yet so petty parliamentary struggles, during which the men of the tongue imagine that by their orations they rule and guide the world, will disappear. They will make room for colleges of administration and administrative delegations, whose purpose will be to consider and determine the best means and methods of production and distribution, to decide how large a quantity of supplies is required, to introduce and utilize new appliances and improvements in art, science, education, traffic, etc., to organize and direct industry and agriculture. . . .

The hundreds of thousands of former representatives of the State will enter various professions, and by their intelligence and strength will help to increase the wealth and comforts of society. Neither political nor common crimes will be known in the future.

The last remark, that there will be no crimes under Socialism, and therefore no punishment for crimes, might at first sight appear to be merely incidental. As a matter of fact, it goes to the very root of the continued existence of the state. Without punishment there is no coercion. And without coercion all the machinery of society becomes in a sense purely voluntary, and individuals who do not wish to partake in the benefit of various social enterprises might be left entirely at liberty not to contribute to their support.

Proportional Representation

By J. SALWYN SCHAPIRO, Ph. D.

The recent Presidential election has revealed two very significant facts: the extraordinary strength shown by the Progressive and Socialist parties at the polls and their still more extraordinary weakness in Congress and in the State legislatures. Of the popular vote for President, Mr. Wilson received in round numbers 6,294,000; Mr. Roosevelt, 4,120,000; Mr. Taft, 3,485,000 and Mr. Debs, 900,000 votes. Under a fair system of representation, there would have been elected to the House of Representatives, 187 Democrats, 121 Progressives, 102 Republicans and 25 Socialists. Actually, the composition of the present House is 297 Democrats, 122 Republicans, 16 Progressives and no Socialists. The Democratic majority in Congress is 159, though its popular vote falls short of being a majority by the rather large figure of 2,447,000; hence in the last election, a minority of the voters of the country returned a large majority of the members of Congress. This “overwhelming” victory of the Democratic party was made possible under an antiquated system of electoral representation, which precludes the idea of more than two parties in the political field, and the natural outcome is very often, as in this instance, a caricature of representative government.

The fundamental principle of universal suffrage is majority rule. The method of “counting heads instead of breaking them” is age-old in the history of the English speaking peoples, and it marked a great step in advance when loose aggregations of voting mobs were organized into voting armies or party organizations. Partly because of economic conditions and partly because of historic circumstances, the two-party system became the dis-

tinguishing feature of the political life of the English people and "to abide by the decisions of the majority" naturally enough came to be regarded as the prime political virtue. So deeply rooted is this idea, that up to the present day it has been considered as a sort of natural law in the political world for every Englishman to be born a little Liberal or a little Conservative. But new conditions make new politics. The entrance of the social question into the political arena, which brought to the fore the issues raised by our modern industrial system, has made the organization of a third party inevitable. This new movement, because it is a natural evolution from present conditions, is not a phenomenon peculiar to America alone. In England the time-honored system of "His Majesty's Government" and "His Majesty's Opposition," the "ins" and the "outs" of English politics, has in part been modified by the entrance of the Labor party as a permanent political organization. The *entente cordiale* which has so long existed between the "Front Benchers," as the leaders of the Liberal and Conservative parties are called, has been rudely shattered by this new party that refused to die when its first demands were granted, but, like Oliver Twist, continually cried for "more." Even in Germany and France, the classic homes of faction government, there are significant signs that the various political factions are coalescing into three solidified groups or "blocs": Conservatives, Radicals and Socialists. A three-party system is the only logical one under present economic conditions, for under such an arrangement, the three great classes of society find legitimate political expression.

Under the present majority system, no sooner is the election over, than the minority, no matter how large, is practically disfranchised; and the majority, no matter how small, takes full power in the name of the "people." The control of the government by special interests is facilitated by this system, as it simplifies their problem; for all they have to do in order to influence legislation is to influence the leaders of the leading party. As long as the voters were divided into two camps, there was a sort of rough justice in saying, "let the stronger rule." But the entrance of the third party in the field has deprived our present electoral system of even its semblance to fairness, for it inevitably leads to government, not by a majority, but by a plurality, i. e. by a minority. At present, the influence of the third party is generally of a sort akin to political blackmail; for by holding the balance of power in closely fought elections it is able to wring concessions from the big parties by threatening to

put a third ticket in the field. In this way the majority parties become "prisoners of the minority." This negative power is alike destructive of political morality and legitimate control of the government. It has been repeatedly shown that in the recent English by-elections, Unionist victories were made possible because the Labor party put candidates in the field with the avowed object of defeating the Liberals. What is needed is an electoral system which will give *every* party its rightful representation and so deprive the minority party of its dangerous power to confuse the popular will. This so-called majority rule is not only admirably suited to the two-party system, but to the two-old-party system, as the difficulties in the way of launching a new party are so great under present conditions, because of the large expense and the need of thorough organization, that independent movements are well nigh impossible unless vitalized by extraordinary leadership.

Majority rule has not only made a farce of representative government by creating a nation-wide "rotten borough" system, but it has facilitated corruption and turned a general election into a game of chance. Each party strains every nerve to capture the necessary *few* votes that would give it control. And what is not sacrificed in this scramble! Small, well-organized groups of voters, frequently under the control of special interests, can, and very often do, dictate the platforms of the candidates. Fighting and cheating at the polls and the buying of votes are directly stimulated by this absurd system of "majority rule." As most elections are won by narrow margins, all that is necessary is to buy or intimidate a few voters and the victory is won. To abstain from voting is very common where the result is certain to be overwhelmingly on one side, as in the South. Many Democrats there do not go to the polls because their party is sure to win, and many Republicans do not go because their party is sure to lose. This state of affairs encourages the shirking of civic responsibility, a very bad thing indeed in a republic. Were there in existence a system of representation where every vote cast would count, many citizens would be encouraged to take their civic duties more seriously. Gerrymandering, too, is directly fostered by the majority system. This dishonest method of planning a constituency for the benefit of one party, does not aim to group citizens of the same political faith in one district—a thing seldom possible—but to group a majority of one party with a minority of the other, in order to sacrifice the interests of

the latter. Under "majority rule" Democracy has become a government of all by the few for the few.

Many people are so confirmed in this fetish of government by mere majority or plurality, that the system appears like one of the eternal verities, and fixed for ever like the sun, moon and stars, or the multiplication table. Now, what is needed is a new electoral system, that will make representative government really representative, if universal suffrage is to have its full political force. The idea, which is destined to become the ruling principle in modern political organization, is known as Proportional Representation, and was first advocated by the great English political thinker, John Stuart Mill, whose sense of political justice was outraged by the unfairness of the majority system. Like all new ideas, Proportional Representation has run the usual gamut of criticism. First it was a "cranky notion," then it became a "fad," and now is in a fair way of becoming a "sound principle." Denmark was the first country to put the theory into practice; since then, it has been adopted by Belgium, the Kingdom of Württemberg in Germany, the Canton of Ticino in Switzerland, Sweden, Finland, and Tasmania. The new Union of South Africa has incorporated the idea for election to the Senate; it has also been adopted by municipalities in several countries. In the Home Rule Bill that is now before the British Parliament, provision was made for Proportional Representation in the election to the Irish Senate. True to their national instincts of applying rational methods to politics, the French have naturally been the first of the great European nations to take the bold progressive step of radically revising their electoral system. In July, 1912, the Chamber of Deputies passed a bill establishing a comprehensive system of Proportional Representation. This measure was defeated on March 18, in the Senate; nevertheless its ultimate adoption seems unavoidable, and it is still true that "what France does to-day, the world will do to-morrow." The Belgian system of Proportional Representation is deliberately designed to favor the largest party; yet the fairness of elections in that country in this regard, at least, shines in contrast with ours. In the last election to the Belgian Chamber of Deputies, the Catholic party received 1,344,449 votes and won 101 seats, the Liberals and Socialists, who formed a combination known as the "cartel," received 1,246,425 votes and won 85 seats. Under this admittedly imperfect system, the Catholics received only four seats more than they were entitled to, according to the size of their popular vote.

Compare this with our recent election, wherein the number of Congressmen elected by the Democrats was actually 110 more than they would have received under any fair system of representation.

Proportional Representation is the first attempt to put the election of candidates on a scientific basis. The fundamental principle of this idea is that each party's representation is to be strictly in proportion to its popular vote. "In a really representative democracy," says John Stuart Mill in his great book on "Representative Government," "any and every section would be represented, not disproportionately but proportionately. A majority of the electors would always have a majority of the representatives; but a minority of the electors would always have a minority of representatives. Man for man they would be as fully represented as the majority." In this paper, I wish to suggest a possible plan, based to a large extent on the best features of the Belgian and French systems.

In the first place, the State, not the district, is to be the unit of Congressional representation. Each party is to present a list of nominees arranged in order of choice, the number of names on each corresponding with the number of members in the State's delegation to Congress. Each elector is to have only *one* vote, which he must cast for the entire list by putting an X in the circle at the top. In case the voter especially desires the election of some particular nominee of his party, he may be permitted to show his preference by putting an X in front of the name of this candidate, in addition to putting an X in the circle at the top. Voting for candidates on *different* tickets is not to be permitted, for the reason that a vote for a Congressman is primarily a vote for the policy of his party, and not for him as an individual. At the end of the poll, the total number of votes cast is to be divided by the number of Congressmen assigned to the State and the result will be the "electoral quotient." Each party will then be entitled to as many seats as the "electoral quotient" is contained in the number of popular votes it received.

An example will perhaps make this plan more clear. In the State of New York, which elects 43 Congressmen, 1,558,000 votes in round numbers were cast in the recent election. Of this, the Democrats received 648,000; the Republicans, 452,000; the Progressives, 383,000; and the Socialists 75,000. Dividing the total 1,558,000 by 43, we get 36,233, the "electoral quotient." To find the number of seats won by the Democrats, let us divide their total vote, 648,000 by the "electoral quotient" 36,233, and

we get 17, with 32,039 remainder votes. In like manner, we divide the Republican vote of 452,000 by 36,233, and we get 12, with 17,209 remainder votes. Dividing the Progressive vote 383,000 by 36,233, we get 10, and 20,670 remainder votes; likewise the Socialist 75,000 by 36,233, and we get 2, and 2,534 remainder votes. The first 17 on the Democratic list, the first 12 on the Republican, the first 10 on the Progressive and the first 2 on the Socialist are declared elected. So far however only 41 Congressmen are chosen, and there are 43 to be elected. We are now faced with the problem of assigning the two remainder seats. This can be simply solved by giving them to those parties that received the highest remainder votes. In the above instance, the Democrats with 32,039 votes to spare will get one seat more, and the Progressives with the next highest remainder, 20,670, will get the other. The process is now complete. Of New York's delegation of 43 Congressmen, there will be elected 18 Democrats, 12 Republicans, 11 Progressives and 2 Socialists. In case any candidate, whose name was below those declared elected, had received preferential votes amounting to at least 36,233, the "electoral quotient," his name would go to the top of the list, and he would therefore be included among the elected. Under the present misrepresentative system of "majority rule," New York's delegation consists of 29 Democrats, 13 Republicans, 1 Progressive and no Socialists. I would also suggest that the party's nominee for President should head each list, and this would of necessity lead to the abolition of the Electoral College and the election of the President by a majority or plurality of the popular vote. The elector would then be compelled to vote for the executive and legislative of the *same* party, and so insure a harmonious relation between President and Congress. Such a change would go a long way towards remedying that fatal defect of our constitution, the "separation of powers," which as Mr. Woodrow Wilson himself has declared is responsible for some of the worst evils in the American system of government.

Nothing is more vicious in its effects than the false impressions of "overwhelming victories" and "crushing defeats" that the majority system fosters. Often, after a "landslide" in favor of one party, a reaction will set in at the next election. This is generally put down to the "fickleness" of the people; whereas, the change of votes in such instances has often been slight or not at all. Mr. J. H. Humphreys, in his excellent book on "Proportional Representation," recently published, has analyzed the popular vote in the famous campaign of 1886 for Irish Home

Rule. In that election, the Liberals, under Mr. Gladstone, were badly defeated; the Conservatives captured 387 seats in Parliament, while the Liberals won only 283 seats. Yet what did the popular vote show? The Liberals received 2,103,594 votes, and the Conservatives 2,049,137; the party that was "crushingly defeated" was actually supported by a majority of the English electorate. Professor John R. Commons, in his book on "Proportional Representation," makes plain that the great Republican victory of 1894 was an illusion. In this election, the Republicans received 5,461,202 votes, and elected 245 Congressmen; the Democrats, 4,295,748 votes and 104 Congressmen; the Populists, 1,323,644 votes and 7 Congressmen. According to these figures the Republican party elected 68.8 per cent. of the representatives but received only 48.4 per cent. of the popular vote.

The most trenchant argument in favor of the present majority system is that it makes for "party responsibility," and so insures the enactment into law of pledges made in the platform. How will Proportional Representation make possible responsible government when, as often will be the case, no single party will have a majority of the representatives? The answer is that it will not. Under the proposed system, the government will, in all likelihood, be carried on by a combination of two parties which have similar principles and which will naturally gravitate toward each other. "Party responsibility" with three parties in the field ceases to be workable the moment the third party becomes strong enough to hold the balance of power between the other two. The situation in England at the present time is very instructive on this point. The Liberals are out-numbered by the Conservatives, but are kept in office through the support of the Labor and Irish parties. Who is "responsible"? Not the Liberals, because they are a minority in Parliament. And no one will pretend that the Laborites and Irish are charged with the duty of conducting His Majesty's Government. This is an instance that will be more typical in the future than at present, and shows the utter futility of the ideal of "party responsibility" under modern conditions.

Proportional Representation is an electoral system that insures justice and fairness, and for this reason alone it should be adopted. Besides, it will inevitably result in the abolition of certain evils in our political life that can be abolished in no other way. Gerrymandering will become impossible if the State and not the district becomes the unit of representation. The parties in order to attract State-wide support for their candidates, will be less likely to nominate mere local celebrities as they now do.

A new type of public representative may be produced, who will be unhampered by the petty cares of "looking after his district" and whose energies will be devoted to the larger interests of his larger constituency. The great number of people who now habitually refrain from voting because they see "no use" in doing so, will be induced to exercise their electoral privilege when they realize that, under this new scheme, their vote will count. It is too much to hope that political purity will reign under any system. Yet few people realize how much there is of stimulated corruption in American politics that would vanish the moment our present electoral system, which puts a premium on bribery and cheating, gave place to one which discouraged such practices by making them fruitless. Politicians seldom buy votes or cheat at the polls in order to carry the Nation or even the State for their party. The direct active inducement is to carry the *district* and elect the *local* candidate; for it is that which brings immediate reward to the briber and repeater. Proportional Representation will diminish the importance of the local candidate in the affairs of State and Nation and so diminish the stimulus to political corruption. The important questions of social reconstruction that have now entered the political field make it imperative that large-minded men be elected as representatives, not those who view society from the angle of a village pump. What is needed is machinery which will push such persons to the fore, and the best device known at the present time is Proportional Representation.

THE HOME CALL

By LOUISE W. KNEELAND

<p>"Come to us! Come to us!" Cry the hills and the sky Radiant with beauty. "We are your friends. Hark to us! Hark to us! Live as the birds do, Care free And air free, Singing their songs.</p>	<p>Why do you tarry When we do the calling? See how the time flies, Ah, why wait till day dies! Come home to the hills Ere black night is falling, Come home to the hills And free life of the sky."</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

THE WORKER SPEAKS

By ISAAC GOLDBERG

This is the fairy-wand—this grimy hand
That builds a palace out of earthy chaos
And rears a poem out of sweat and sand.
This is Aladdin's lamp—this mangled limb
Without whose brawn your vastest plans were naught.
I am the modern Atlas: on my back
Weighs all the world. Woe unto them that ride
If I but rise, a crazed Leviathan,
And fling my burden to the infinite
Whence first it came!

I say I will be free!

By this same fairy-wand—this grimy hand!
Speak, will you give, or shall I take. 'Tis one.
Speak, shall the arm that conjured up your ease
Build, too, its freedom from your ruined spoils?
Speak, or must I, perforce, who give you food,
Speak for you, too? Beware, then, what I say!

THE DREAM-SONG

By JOSEPH MORSE GREENE

I sang a song in my dream; 'twas once
When the day had glimmered low,
And the sacred light
In the land of Night
Had wrapped me in its glow;
An ego free in that mystic sea
I stood serene and strong,—
The clogs of Day
Had been thrown away
When I burst into that song!

The mists of old, that had grossly shut
My vision from the sky,
To crystal turned,
And that vision burned
Like the eagle's piercing eye;
While the mighty thought by earth's giants wrought,
Once blinding to my sight,
Filled that song of mine
With a theme divine
As it swept their halls of light!

And I thought, when the bonds of strife and care,
 That with their weight of gloom
 Crush earth's gems to dust,
 Turn its gold to rust,
 Life's palace to a tomb,
 Shall lifted be from you and me,
 And the ransomed mind shall spring
 In conscious might
 To its native height—
 What a song it then will sing!

When from Man's bruised body fall away
 Wrongs that with cruel spell,
 Through th' gateways dark
 Of matter, mark
 The spirit in its cell,—
 When to hands that spoil, the hands that toil
 Shall cease their toll to bring,
 And a manhood, grown,
 Shall take its own—
 What a song we then shall sing!

When the riches endless, springing forth
 From the mighty Mother's store,
 Shall their gladdening tide,
 As the ocean wide,
 For all her children pour,
 And the means of breath—keys of life and death
 That open Labor's gate—
 Come no longer through
 But a master few,
 While the many supplicate;—

When Genius' wasted form no more
 Shall cower in its dust
 O'er Want's foul heap—
 While angels weep—
 To dig the refuse crust;
 When no longer men in a gilded den
 To pillaged baubles cling,
 But from land to land
 Reach a brother's hand—
 What a song this world will sing!

Then the crimson flood of the driven throng,
 Which 'neath Fame's battle-car,
 At the merry list
 Of some godling, hissed
 In the flaming pit of war,
 Shall from sea to sea the sweet symbol be
 Of a bond by Freedom blest;—
 O, what notes will rise
 To the cloudless skies
 In that song of a world at rest!

I can hear its far, faint cadence now,
 As from the distant blue,—
 Hear the coming, dim,
 Of the grandest hymn
 Earth's bondmen ever knew;—
 And I know my soul, as that night it stole
 From slavery's shackles free,
 Sang with prophet tone
 From the spirit's throne
 The Song that is to be!

The New Paganism

By TOM QUELCH.

The Socialist objective is essentially the attainment of a full life by the individual.

Not as an individualistic anti-social being, but as one whose vital life-principle is in the common good.

Good things to eat, good things to drink, material comforts of all descriptions, opportunities of travel—all these things are promised by Socialism. It is this promise which provides the basic element of our movement. Socialists are, before everything else, materialists.

Some have come into our movement and talked of the fasting cure. Others have entered and attempted to thrust vegetarianism and allied diets upon us. Yet others have insisted that a weak, anemic Puritanism should be our guiding principle. Even the Leader of the British Labour party—Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.—attempted, in an article entitled "A Plea for Puritanism" in the *Socialist Review* some time ago, to saddle us with this most obnoxious cult.

We are not believers in the fasting cure; we are not committed to vegetarianism, nor are we Puritans.

If fasting is good, then we can get plenty of it under capitalism, and change is unnecessary. Vegetarianism, as such, is a cult, and, while it may suit some people, it does not suit others. Animals have provided food for man through the ages. To live a dry, hard, colorless life as demonstrated by Puritans: walking about with sober, gloomy faces; wearing nothing but the plainest clothes; eating nothing but the plainest food; and regarding life more in the nature of a tearful burden than anything else, seems to me to be the very opposite of what we desire.

Capitalism itself is essentially Puritan for the worker. He only obtains sufficient to secure the meanest and barest of livelihoods.

There is, indeed, a very close alliance between capitalism and religious Puritanism. It can be historically demonstrated that capitalism has been fostered and developed—especially in England where the Puritan revolution under Cromwell and Fairfax won the rising bourgeoisie political power—by Puritanism. The most backward countries in Europe to-day, from a capitalist point of view—Spain and Ireland for instance—are Catholic countries.

Socialism aims at making life joyful, not sorrowful. A wise, healthy paganism—giving free and vigorous play to all our faculties—realizing the potentialities embedded in us—is what we should strive for.

Life should be full of color, of brightness, of joy, of laughter. Mankind seems to have lost the laughing habit. Jack London well brings home to us, in his "Before Adam," the fact that primitive man was a great laugh. And in its way life should also be to us a great hunger and a great struggle. A hunger for happiness, for beautiful things, for more knowledge, for self-expression in every conceivable way.

And we should ceaselessly struggle to attain these ends.

Socialists have been accused of trying to take the "struggle" element out of life. As a matter of fact, when we do away with the sordid economic struggle the real struggle begins.

Socialism aims at the development of all our faculties to the greatest possible extent—physical and mental. In a way it revives the Hellenic ideal of physical and mental greatness. It extends immeasurably in every direction our sense of appreciation. How few people there are—cursed by the blighting effects of capitalism—who realize what a magic world this is. To the majority, bred in gloomy industrial hells, the beauty of a moonlit forest or a red dawn has no appeal. To the majority the stars are just mysterious lights in the heavens—for they know nothing of the marvels of astronomy. To the majority loving kindness and higher ethical impulses are practically foreign, being crushed by capitalism.

The most tragic fact in our time is that men and women should pass through life without realizing the wonders and joys of it.

That is why I loathe and hate commercialism. The present

system simply tends to develop the sordid side of our natures. It rouses greed and mercenary cunning. It fosters treachery and hypocrisy and vice. It acts as a devastating blight upon our nobler instincts. It does not give the good in our psychological make-up a fair show. It tramples and murders and ruthlessly destroys with reckless abandon.

Socialism—the New Paganism—under which humanity will eat wisely but well, drink wisely but well, will bring into being a splendid race, such as pictured in the paintings of Rubens. A race of physical and intellectual giants, or, as Kautsky says, a race of supermen.

Think what it means. Think of all the peoples of the earth united: mutually aiding and enlightening one another, their economic necessities easily satisfied by the intelligent organization of production. The earth made to shower her bounties upon her children, in endless profusion. Triumphant mankind making inroads into science, conceiving new forms of art, rearing matchless temples to higher ethical codes, giving free and majestic play to the imaginative faculties.

Up to now mankind has simply sneered at life—flung it away in shoddy pursuits and mean gropings. Yet even these give suggestions of what might come. History is but the reservoir of human accomplishment. It presents to our astonished gaze all the marvels of past civilizations. And if a semi-blind, semi-barbaric humanity can give us Babylon, Carthage, Athens, Rome, Venice and all the other wonders—what might it not accomplish if free economically and thoroughly enlightened? A humanity in which the genius of East and West is combined, inspiring, transfiguring, striving always for human advancement.

There is, in our great International Socialist Movement, the embryo of the wonderful civilization to come.

The Overrated John Masefield

By ANDRE TRIDON

Favorable reviews have led me to read so much printed rot that I seldom take another man's word about books. I have found great men, especially, either too severe or too lenient in their criticisms. Yet, after the things Galsworthy told me a year ago concerning Masefield, I could only make a dash for the libraries and, having discovered that they didn't have Masefield's works on their shelves, order half a dozen of his books from England. As luck would have it I thoroughly disliked those of Masefield's writings which impressed Galsworthy most deeply; while the author of "A Man of Property" (one of the biggest novels ever written) felt attracted to Masefield by his poetic feeling, I was principally taken up with Masefield's brutality.

Here was a man at last who juggled shamelessly with the taboo words, and, wonderful symptom of Anglo-Saxon broadening, England read his stuff and liked it. No Comstock seized the journal in which the following lines appeared:

"From three long hours of gin and smoke
And two girls' breath and fifteen blokes,
A warmish night and windows shut,
The room stank like a fox's gut."

Elsewhere he describes the caresses of lovers in their bed room in words which, if quoted, would cause the NEW REVIEW to be debarred from the mails. And that appeared in the *English Review*.

This was most interesting; it proved, first, that England's awakening from her Puritan coma was near, and secondly, that England's awakening was closer at hand than America's. For, barring one magazine whose editor had shown some daring, all our publications are wedded to the ladylike inanities which are more certain symptoms of intellectual degradation than the healthy "obscenities" of Congreve, Mrs. Behn or . . . Shakespeare. But even that magazine would have balked at Masefield's poetry.

Now brutality of expression may not in itself constitute a title to artistic fame. We must not forget, however, that the ladylike vocabulary which so-called good breeding compels us

to be content with leaves us generally without any means of expression when it comes to discussing the most vital questions. When people accustom themselves to calling all things by their names and not by equivalents, they will in all likelihood look things in the face and find that they are quite able to cope with them.

Before this country or England can produce a Zola, a Maupassant, a D'Annunzio, an Artsibasheff, a Peter Nansen, a Schnitzler, a Wedekind, writers must have at their disposal an uncastrated copy of Webster.

John Masefield's fame is quite recent. His first book wasn't published until 1908; England began to call him a genius two years ago and, as I said before, it was well nigh impossible in January, 1912, to secure in New York a copy of his books.

He was born about thirty-eight years ago in a Shropshire village in England. A clever boy, he evinced an early aversion for the dead stuff contained in school books and the dead explanations offered by teachers.

Tired of his individualism and of his roving propensities, his family decided to provide an outlet at least for the latter by turning him over, when he was barely fourteen, to the skipper of a merchantman. The seven seas spat their scud in his face for several years; he sickened of ships, became a tramp, then sickened of roadside ruts and went back to his bunk below decks, and then tramped some more. . . .

One day, being then twenty-eight years of age, Masefield decided to take ship for America. He tried his hand at many things and failed in every one of them. He finally found himself stranded in New York at the beginning of a sultry summer.

Two friends, in the same desperate straits, were at that time sharing a garret in Greenwich village, where he joined them. For several days they lived on doughnuts and on sandwiches of the free lunch counters, while they tramped about the city looking for work.

Finally Masefield secured a job as pot boy, dish washer and bouncer at the Colonial Hotel on Sixth Avenue, which has since been torn down.

After several months of that life, which from a financial point of view was not very profitable, but which enlarged greatly his store of experience and broadened his views on life and the human animal, Masefield returned to England.

Jack Yeats, William Butler's brother, prevailed upon him then to pause a while and to describe for the benefit of the public

his adventures on land and sea. This led to more or less regular hack work, which led to marriage, which led to more work, and then the tramp settled down. At thirty-nine, the father of two children, two novels, several plays and several books of poems, he has probably sworn off roving.

It is perhaps premature to pass judgment upon Masefield as a writer. It is difficult to tell what road he will travel. Will he be a novelist or a playwright or a poet?

As a novelist he has done very cloying work, and yet there is in his novels a distinct promise of originality.

"Multitude and Solitude" is distinctly boresome. A dramatist produces an unsuccessful play, starts a flirtation with a neighbor after the performance, helps a sick person in trouble, reads that his fiancée has been drowned and goes to Africa with a man who is studying the sleeping sickness. Then for a hundred and fifty pages we are treated to accounts of medical experiments.

"The Street of To-day" is worse. A long-drawn story, starting from nowhere and leading nowhere, with tricks à la Bob Chambers. You know the scheme: man much taken up with a woman; gives dinner party for her at his rooms; all guests back out; she comes, she stays, they talk for hours in the dark . . . and then she goes home. No, nothing happened, but the dishonest trickster of an author had been trying all the time to make us believe that things would happen.

And yet there is a clearness of characterization in these two books, an impression of living life which few modern novelists have succeeded in giving us. Masefield does not bother with construction. There is no visible plot. Unity is preserved by the use of a central figure, a man in both cases to whom things happen, through whose eyes we see his world and nothing beyond his world.

Masefield the playwright has given us "The Tragedy of Nan," "Mrs. Harrison," and the "Campden Wonder." The first-named is considered by Galsworthy as the most notable play he has witnessed in the past ten years! For this reason only will I mention the subject of it:

The scene is laid in the house of a small farmer at Broad Oak on Severn in the year 1810. In those days English law still allowed a death sentence to be inflicted upon the flimsiest evidence and for the most trifling misdeed. Nan Hardwick's father has just been hanged for sheep stealing. Nan, a beautiful young girl, is living with her uncle, Farmer Pargetter, kind of

heart but very weak. His wife, a cruel shrew, and his daughter Jennie, a shallow, empty-headed creature, take turns in making Nan's life unendurable. Jennie is in love with a village swain called Dick Gurvil. Dick, however, has some misgivings because he does not know anything about Nan's father. Very cleverly, Mrs. Pargetter manages to reveal to him what he didn't know and to frighten him into announcing that very night his engagement to Jennie. This he does for very practical reasons, being led to believe that farmer Pargetter will be rather liberal towards his son-in-law.

In the third act, officers of the Crown come to offer Nan the realm's apology and fifty pounds compensation. Her father had gone to his death owing to a miscarriage of justice.

And the ever-practical Dick Gurvil would be perfectly willing to forsake Jennie once more in order to win Nan's "treasure." In a frenzy of indignation Nan stabs him and then goes to throw herself into the sea.

All this is very unsophisticated, to say the least. Certain scenes, like the one in which Nan compels her rival Jennie to eat pie made of the meat of a sick sheep, are too silly to be gruesome. After "The Jungle" ptomaine-dramatic thrills are not sufficiently convincing. It may be that Masefield, the poet, is destined to eclipse Masefield, the novelist, and Masefield, the playwright.

The subjects of his poems are all drawn from the life of the working class. He likes to depict simple folk in whom, owing to the monotony of their tasks or the sameness of their environment, one dominant feeling becomes an obsession and drives them to deeds of tragic import. From his four poems, "The Everlasting Mercy," "The Widow in the Bye Street," "The Story of a Round House," and "Daffodil Fields," the first and second deserve an extended notice. The "Story of a Round House" is distinctly uninteresting and "Daffodil Fields" is spoiled by an affectation of language of which we can give the reader a good idea by quoting lines he puts in the mouth of a young farmer:

"I want to go
Somewhere where man has never used a plough,
Nor ever read a book; where clean winds blow,
And passionate blood is not its owner's foe,
And land is for the asking of it. There
Man can create a life and have the open air."

"I shall be back in England six weeks hence,
Standing with your poor Mary face to face;
Far from a pleasant moment, but intense."

"The Everlasting Mercy," from which I quoted a few brutal lines at the beginning of this article, is quite an extraordinary pen picture:

Saul Kane, the leading character of this dramatic poem, a poacher and village loafer, introduces himself to the public in the following fashion:

"From '41 to '51
I was my folk's contrary son;
I bit my father's hand right through
And broke my mother's heart in two.
I sometimes go without my dinner
Now that I know the times I've gin her.

From '51 to '61
I cut my teeth and took to fun.
I learned what not to be afraid of
And what stuff women's lips are made of;
I learned with what a rosy feeling
Good ale makes floors seem like the ceiling,
And how the moon gives shiny light
To lads as roll home singing by't.
My blood did leap, my flesh did revel,
Saul Kane was tokened to the devil."

Saul Kane and Billy Meyers have an argument one night when both wish to poach in the same patch of woods:

"Now when he saw me set my snare,
He tells me 'Get to hell from there.
This field is mine,' he says, 'by right;
If you poach here, there'll be a fight.
Out now,' he says, 'and leave your wire,
It's mine'"

"It ain't"

"You put"

"You liar"

"I'll fight you for it."
"Right, by damn"

The fight takes place, Kane knocks out his opponent and then the gang, picking up some women on its way, repairs to "The Lion" for a night of it. The lines I quoted at the beginning depict the morning after. The story ends in an unexpected way. One night at closing time, a little Quakeress enters the bar room where Kane is swilling bad whiskey, empties his glass on the floor and preaches a sermon to him. The brutishness of the boxing club, the feast of filth at the Lion, the gin of Si's bar-room are miraculously wiped off his soul. Here we begin to feel slightly cynical. And Saul Kane, who fortunately has not become a saint, tells us of his impressions on the clear morning after he was "saved":

"I heard a partridge covey call,
The morning sun was bright on all.
Down the long slope the plough team drove,
The tossing rooks arose and hove.

A stone struck on the share. A word
Came to the team. The red earth stirred.
I crossed the hedge by shooter's gap,
I hitched my boxer's belt a strap,
I jumped the ditch and crossed the fallow:
I took the hales from farmer Callow."

"The Widow in the Bye Street" is probably Masefield's masterpiece. There is Jim Gurney, the young journeyman, a real live worker shown in action as follows:

"He got a job at working on the line
Tipping the earth down, trolley after truck,
From daylight till the evening, wet or fine,
With arms all red from wallowing in the muck,
And spitting, as the trolley tipped, for luck,
And singing 'Binger' as he swung the pick
Because the red blood ran in him so quick."

Jim lived with his old mother, "withered eyes below her lashes, eyelids red and bleared," who made a living by sewing for an undertaker.

"So there was bacon then, at night, for supper
In Bye Street there, where he and mother stay;
And boots they had, not leaky in the upper,
And room rent ready on the settling day;
And beer for poor, old mother, worn and gray,
And fire in frost; and in the widow's eyes
It seemed the Lord had made earth paradise.

And there they sat of evenings after dark
Singing their song of 'Binger,' he and she,
Her poor old cackle made the mongrels bark.
And "you sing 'Binger,' mother," carols he;
"By crimes, but that's a good song, that her be".
And then they slept there in the room they shared,
And all the time fate had his end prepared."

Anna, the village enchantress, soon breaks up this happy home. When her lover, Shepherd Ern, forsakes her for Bessie, the gipsy, she entices Jimmy away from his mother. Jimmie no longer brings his pay home. He buys silver trinkets for his lady fair, until one night, watching jealously her house, he surprises her with Shepherd Ern. With a plough bat Jimmy lays his rival low. And then they hang him. And the old widowed mother:

"She tottered home, back to the little room,
It was all over for her but for life.
She drew the blinds and trembled in the gloom.
And slowly sorrow obliterated all thought from her grieving mind."

After closing Masefield's books one is apt to experience an unsatisfied feeling. His vision is sharp but terribly narrow. The characters he creates are not puppets, but real human beings; they are not stuffed with sawdust; there is blood in their arteries; only their miserable little egos are ceaselessly brood-

ing on one subject, on some sentimental woe; seldom if ever does their mind stray away from the sore which it seems bent on keeping open and bleeding. Simple and stubborn, those people are not good company; they are not of the type that grows; they know not of the limitless world of which they are a part; they do not throb with it; they do not even suspect its mighty throbbing. They are the inert snobs of the social ooze even as Bourget's or D'Annunzio's characters are the inert snobs of the upper crust. This deficiency appears even more crucial to us when found in a contemporary of H. G. Wells, G. B. Shaw, John Galsworthy and G. K. Chesterton.

It is no longer permissible, nowadays, for a novelist (and after all Masefield's poems are short stories in verse) to isolate his characters in a pneumatic vacuum. The interlocking of individuals, the interdependence of destinies, the dovetailing of personal histories is a truth to which we can no longer remain blind. None of the economic forces at work in the modern world seems to affect Masefield's prize fighters, journeymen or farmers. On every occasion their fates seem to depend upon their whims of the moment. The world being taken for granted, men and women are only slaves to themselves. A decidedly oldish attitude of mind, which may give us a clue perhaps to Masefield's success in the English world of letters in spite of his violence of expression, of his brutal frankness. His vocabulary alone is revolutionary. His mind is, I fear, utterly conservative.

MORGAN AND VIERECK

By LOUISE W. KNEELAND

Yah!—here comes your American hero
 With his cigar stuck in his mouth,
 Swinging his cane.
 Brushing the people aside like flies
 And entering into his own.
 Good! Admire him, Viereck,
 And give him his Heaven:
 He deserves it—it's empty.

School Feeding: A Book Review

By GRACE POTTER

Louise Stevens Bryant in "School-Feeding"* has written the first history of the movement for feeding school children. Fifty American cities are serving meals to at least part of the children, and several European countries have done so for many years.

The facts regarding the movement, which Mrs. Bryant has gathered from leaflets, pamphlets and correspondence in several different languages, are so vital and surprising and her dispassionate scientific presentation of them so forceful, that even the most conservative is left little reason to question any longer whether hungry school children should be fed before they are taught. By comparing the growth of this movement with that of medical inspection and playgrounds the prophecy is hazarded that within two years arrangements for providing warm meals, dinner or lunch if not breakfast, for school children will be under way in all large American cities and the most progressive rural districts.

Why School Children Should Be Fed.

Among the reasons why hungry school children should be fed, the one that is already most familiar to parents and teachers is that they will learn more rapidly. With the further reasons we are not so familiar. Poor feeding causes degeneracy, and is therefore responsible for much crime as well as inefficiency; it makes children susceptible to infectious diseases of all kinds, including diphtheria, scarlet fever, and tuberculosis; it hinders a child's recovery from many diseases, such as eye and ear trouble and diseases resulting from scrofula. Not the least interesting reason is that children will come to school more readily if they are well-fed. Statistics from Milan, Italy, show that school feeding reduced the average of non-attendance from 28 per cent. to 6 per cent. in that town.

* School Feeding, Its History and Practice at Home and Abroad, by Louise Stevens Bryant. J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia and London. \$1.50.

Children Should Not Be Subject to Charity.

An important point made is that the feeding should be a part of the school system and not come under the Poor Laws nor be left to the supervision of charitable organizations. Where it has been tried in the latter way the children have been too humiliated to get the best results, and parents have often forbidden the children to accept the meals. The funds, too, of charity organizations are very uncertain. People, it seems, give to charity on religious holidays and when the weather is bad. They are apt to forget that little children get hungry every day in the year. This has therefore led, in many places where it has been tried, to the taking over of the responsibility for the work by the school system itself.

In Europe as well as America, where school meals have been instituted, the poor children are fed free, and the children able to do so, pay. Especial care is taken that the children who receive free meals are unknown to any but the supervisors of the lunch room.

Cost of Meals.

To the mother whose life is one long tragedy of cooking and buying and making both ends meet, the cost of the meals served at school will be illuminating. Wholesale buying and cooking makes the serving of meals to a single family by comparison seem extremely expensive. In New York City, in the Italian districts, meals are served for 4.7 cents, in St. Louis the school children are fed at 2.5 cents a meal. In Angers, France, they have served warm meals since 1871, for which the cost is 2 cents. In Paris it is 3; in Bradford, England, breakfast costs 2.5 and dinner a little less than 3 cents. A really sumptuous meal is served at Charlottenburg, Germany, for 4 cents.

Sample Menus.

It may possibly be thought that food which can be bought and prepared at such low prices can be neither varied in character nor pleasing in variety. But scientific analysis of foods, good cooking and an understanding of children's needs, combined with the wholesale buying, overcome this.

In feeding the children from the slums of the big cities, it is found that many of them are so poorly nourished that they are not even hungry at first. They have lost the power of such a healthy reaction as hunger. Fed on pickles and coffee and the

cheapest baker's bread, they have no taste for wholesome nourishing food until they are taught to like it. They readily learn this however, helped by the companionship of the other children and the cheerful supervision of teachers.

Besides the value of the food as such to the children, it is of no little consequence that good habits of eating are established which will help them all their lives.

In Milwaukee, where school lunches have been served for years, a sample menu is thick vegetable soup, baked beans and potato, bread and butter, milk, pop corn, peanuts and fruit. Cincinnati has a system of penny lunches, so-called, where several different items are sold for one cent each. The list includes baked potato, baked beans, hot meat sandwich, jam sandwich, banana, apple, etc.

In Paris, soup, meat and a vegetable, with bread and sometimes a sweet is served. In Bradford, England, where there are 10,000 meals a day prepared, for breakfast the children have oatmeal porridge with treacle and milk, and bread and butter. For dinner 17 different menus are served in rotation, of which the following is a fair sample: Cottage pie with crust, green peas with gravy, bread and stewed fruit. In Milan the little Italians get, for example, for one day's dinner, soup, bread and macaroni and cheese prepared with olive oil. The delicate children are given fresh eggs. Thirty-eight per cent. of the school children in Milan eat these school meals.

How the Food Is Prepared.

In large cities the cost is kept down to the above quoted small prices, even though regular cooks are employed. In many places children assist in minor ways, the work coming under the head of domestic science. In one rural district in Minnesota the children, under the direction of a very energetic, up-to-date young teacher, prepare their own meal. It is cooked in a fireless cooker. At noon it is served in the one big room which the limited accommodations afford for kitchen, dining room, and school.

There is a decided effort made in most places to make the dining rooms pretty and attractive and the children help to make and keep them so. They bring flowers and plants from home and the woods, and often dainty china.

History of the Movement.

School feeding began over a century ago in Germany. Victor Hugo started it in England in the early sixties, when he

provided warm meals at his home in Guernsey for the children in near-by schools. In France it began in 1849, and now school feeding is universal there. In certain parts of Austria, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, and Denmark school meals are provided. Holland had the first national legislation in regard to school feeding. Switzerland followed next. In Switzerland before Federal funds were available for the school meals, money which was raised by the tax on alcohol was applied to cover the expense. School feeding in the country districts of Sweden, where the children often live five or six miles away, walking both to and fro, is being gradually introduced. It was begun in the large towns, some twenty years ago. Padua, Italy, is the first place in the world where an attempt was made to have the school meals planned scientifically to meet the special needs of the children. The medical inspector outlines the menus. He plans to have one dinner provide one-half of the food values necessary for a child's daily needs.

Legislation.

Mrs. Bryant has considered in detail the question of legislation for school feeding. She quotes Helene Simon, a well-known German writer on the subject, who summarizes the provisions for national legislation as follows:

(a) School feeding must be provided where it is an assured need. The children of those parents who are on the lists of charity association as well as those who pay no taxes, *i. e.*, whose income falls below 900 marks (about \$225), shall be considered as needy without further question.

(b) Lists of cases requiring help shall be made out and investigated periodically.

(c) The dietaries shall be determined on physiological grounds. Provisions shall be made possible for breakfast and dinner for the whole year.

(d) The rooms where the meals are served should be in the school or adjoining buildings. All details must be left to the discretion of local school boards.

Every adult person, whether a parent or not, is beginning to feel that to understand the problems of childhood in general, is a part of the education of his own social consciousness. On this account "School Feeding" will interest every one. It is, too, of special interest to Boards of Education who wish to investigate the results of school feeding and start it in their own schools. There is scientific information in regard to a child's food needs,

menus and how to prepare them, cost of raw materials, equipment necessary for cooking and serving, etc. These carefully tabulated data will enable any locality to introduce school feeding with little trouble without duplicating the errors made elsewhere.

No one can read this book without thought of what that part of the world that lets its future men and women go hungry, is wantonly losing in human values and money. But the significance of the book lies not so much in its forceful telling of what has been done, as in the hope it holds out for what may be done. And then human children will cease to be the only young in the universe more poorly cared for than adults.

A Note on Industrial Concentration

By FRANK EMERSON

It is interesting to trace the growth of industries in the United States from 1904 to 1909. During that period the percentage of increase of proprietors and firm-members was 21.1%, of salaried employes, 52.1%, and of wage-earners only 21.0%. Salaries increased 63.4% from 1904 to 1909. The increase in wages has of course never kept pace with the increase in the value added by manufacture. Thus the increase of wages from 1904 to 1909 was 31.1%, the increase of value added by manufacture, 35.5%. From 1899 to 1909 wages increased 70.6%, but the value added by manufacture increased 76.6%.

A study of the character of ownership of manufacturing enterprises shows that in 1909, 52.4% of all such enterprises were controlled by individuals, 20.2% by firms and 25.9% by corporations. But the individuals and firms representing 72.6% of all establishments employed only 24.2% of the wage-earners and the total value of their products was 20.5%, while the 25.9% of establishments controlled by corporations employed 75.6% of all wage-earners and their total value of products was 79.9%. How rapid is the growth of industrial enterprises may be seen from the fact that the number of establishments controlled by corporations rose from 23.6% in 1904 to 25.9% in 1909, the number of wage-earners rose from 70.6% to 75.6%, and the value of products from 73.7% to 79.0%.

It is of course natural for industries where a large investment in plant and machinery is necessary (such as smelting and refining, blast furnaces, steel works, rolling mills, etc.), to be operated by corporations. But even in industries which serve directly our bodily wants such increased control by corporations is evident. In the boot and shoe industry in 1904 the value of products of establishments operated by corporations was 58.8%; in 1909 it rose to 71.3%. In the canning and preserving industry the value of products of establishments operated by corporations was 60.0% in 1904 and 74.2% in 1909. To-day, 32.9% of the total value of products in the men's

clothing industry and 23.6% of that of the women's clothing industry is controlled by corporations.

This tendency toward industrial concentration has been noticeable in all the states of the Union and in the following table are given the percentages of the value of products of establishments operated by corporations for some of the more important industrial states:

	Per Cent. of Total	
	1904	1909
Illinois	83.6	85.8
Massachusetts	72.1	79.4
Michigan	76.5	83.4
Missouri	86.3	88.6
New Jersey	79.7	84.8
New York	56.1	62.6
Ohio	80.9	86.9
Pennsylvania	71.1	78.2

In 1909 establishments having products to the value of from \$100,000 up to \$1,000,000 and more, represented 11.5% of the total number of establishments, but these establishments employed 74.3% of the wage-earners, and their total value of product was 82.2%.

"The Putumayo"

To the Editor of the NEW REVIEW:

In your prefatory note to my article, "The White Man's Burden," which appeared in the May issue of the NEW REVIEW, you state that my book "The Putumayo; The Devil's Paradise" (London, Unwin) was published in 1909.

The fact is that my exposures were first published in the London *Truth* in 1909, but it was not until after Consul Casement's Report was made public in July, 1912, that I could find a publisher who would undertake to handle my book. This was undoubtedly due to fear of libel proceedings, for the law of libel in England is much more strictly interpreted than here. Consequently, my book did not make its appearance before last December.

W. E. HARDENBURG.

New York, April 10th, 1913.

Books Received

John Spargo, *Syndicalism, Industrial Unionism and Socialism*; 243 pp. B. W. Huebsch, New York. \$1.25.

Emile Pouget, *Sabotage* (translated by Arturo Giovannitti); 108 pp. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. Cloth 50c., paper 25c.

Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (translated by Daniel De Leon); 160 pp. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. Cloth 50c., paper 25c.

Ellen Key, *Rahel Varnhagen*; 312 pp. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London. \$1.50.

Max Eastman, *Enjoyment of Poetry*; 224 pp. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. \$1.25.

Albert Edwards, *Comrade Yetta*; 448 pp. The Macmillan Co., New York. \$1.35.

John Graham Brooks, *American Syndicalism—The I. W. W.*; 264 pp. The Macmillan Co., New York. \$1.50.